Being American in Europe

1750–1860

Daniel Kilbride

VISIT…

Being American in Europe
1750–1860

This page intentionally left blank

Being American in Europe 1750–1860

DANIEL KILBRIDE

The Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore

© 2013 The Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2013
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
2 4 6 8 9 7 5 3 1

The Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kilbride, Daniel, 1968–
Being American in Europe, 1750–1860 / Daniel Kilbride.
pages cm
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4214-0899-6 (hardcover : acid-free paper) —
ISBN 1-4214-0899-6 (hardcover : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-1-4214-0900-9 (electronic) — ISBN 1-4214-0900-3 (electronic)
1. Americans—Travel—Europe—History. 2. Europe—Description and travel. 3. Americans—Europe—Ethnic identity—History. 4. Ethnicity—Europe—History. 5. Europe—Social life and customs—18th century. 6. Europe—Social life and customs—19th century. 7. Europe—Foreign public opinion, American. 8. Travelers' writings, American—Europe. I. Title.
D917.K55 2013
305.813'0409034—dc23 2012035552

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Special discounts are available for bulk purchases of this book. For more information, please contact Special Sales at 410-516-6936 or specialsales@press.jhu.edu.

The Johns Hopkins University Press uses environmentally friendly book materials, including recycled text paper that is composed of at least 30 percent post-consumer waste, whenever possible.

Acknowledgments *vii*
Routes of Four American Travelers in Europe *ix*

Introduction 1

1 "English association," 1750–1783 9

2 "The blows my republican principles receive are forcible," 1783–1820 45

3 "What we Anglo-Americans understand by the significant word comfort," 1821–1850 81

4 "The manifold advantages resulting from our glorious Union," 1840s–1861 124

Conclusion 167

Notes *173*
Essay on Sources *215*
Index *223*

This page intentionally left blank

I have been working on this book for a while. I am glad to have at long last the opportunity to thank the many people and organizations that helped me see it to fruition.

My longest-lasting debt is to the Department of History at the University of Florida and to the friends and colleagues I made there, whose fingerprints are all over this book. I owe much to the usual suspects: Brains, Dutch Gomez, Ignatuius, and Granddad. I also thank Ronald Formisano and, particularly, the late Bertram-Wyatt Brown, for whose friendship and mentoring I am deeply grateful.

Many of the ideas in this book were floated initially as conference papers. I thank Bernard Bailyn for providing me with the opportunity to present my work twice to the International Seminar on the History of the Atlantic World at Harvard University, and I am grateful to the participants at those gatherings for their constructive criticism. I also wish to acknowledge Catherine Allgor, Chris Beneke, Joyce Chaplin, David Hackett Fischer, Sam Haynes, Joseph Henning, John Murrin, Michael O'Brien, and Mark M. Smith for their comments and suggestions. Various people pointed me to sources or provided me with tips and other kinds of help, including Donald G. Rohr, James Green, Charles M. Johnson, and Jenny Goloboy.

I thank the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Library Company of Philadelphia, Virginia Historical Society, and American Antiquarian Society for providing the financial support that made it possible to conduct long-term research in their outstanding collections. At the American Antiquarian Society, the company of Peter Reed, Peter Messer, and Jeannine DeLombard made the time pass most agreeably. My gratitude also goes out to the staff at these institutions and the many others that I have visited, for their competence and good cheer. John Carroll University also provided funds for research and travel.

Researching and writing a book while raising a young family is no easy task—especially for that family. I wish to thank my wife and kids for their many indulgences over the past ten or so years.

This page intentionally left blank

Robert C. Johnson, 1792–93
Duncan Farrar Kenner, 1833–34
Anne Tuttle Jones Bullard, 1850
Mary Telfair, 1851
Loch Katrine
Stirling
Glasgow
Edinburgh
Belfast
Dublin
Holyhead
Leeds
York
Manchester
Bangor
Sheffield
Liverpool
Birmingham
Bristol
Oxford
Bath
London
Southampton
Dover
Isle of Wight
Calais
Ghent
Brighton
Boulogne
Cologne
Leipzig
Dresden
Abbeville
Liege
Bonn
Aachen
Dieppe
Amiens
Prague
Havre
Rouen
Chantilly
Frankfurt
Paris
Heidelberg
Metz
Karlsruhe
Orleans
Tours
Blois
Vienna
Basel
Dijon
Baden
Berne
Gratz
Geneva
Lausanne
Martigny
Bordeaux
Lyons
Chamonix-Mont Blanc
Chambery
Milan
Venice
Trieste
Turin
Genoa
Ferrara
Toulouse
Orange
Bologna
Lucca
Montpellier
Florence
Pisa
Nice
Livorno
Marseilles
Siena
Toulon
Viterbo
Rome
Naples
0 200 400 600 Km.
0 100 200 300 400 Mi.

This page intentionally left blank

Being American in Europe
1750–1860

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

In 1844 Harry McCall, a ne'er-do-well Philadelphian making the Grand Tour of Europe, wrote to tell his cousin Peter what his travels had taught him about Rome and the Romans. He was not impressed. "[W]e have no sympathies with these people," he explained. "*We are not of them*—and a great change must take place before *we are*, if that *ever* happens." But McCall's quarrel was with Europe, not merely Italy. He dismissed it all, telling his cousin that his travels through Great Britain, France, Italy, and Greece had only intensified his already avid patriotism. He did not mind Paris, although he socialized with hardly any Parisians. He preferred the company of Americans, "swarms" of whom had descended on the city during the hot summer months, after the fashionable population had moved out into the countryside. Florence he admired for being unlike Rome. He credited its cultivated fields and contented people to the despotic yet "parental" government that ruled over Tuscany. Like so many Americans, he had great expectations for Greece and Constantinople, but the poverty and decay he saw there only produced "sickening disappointment." Worst of all, however, was England. All of Europe was alien territory, irrelevant to the great drama unfolding across the Atlantic, but McCall reserved special venom for the English people. He resolved to be "an *American*, heart and soul" wherever he visited in Europe, but "*particularly in England*."[1] McCall's implacable hostility to Europe raises some puzzling questions: If the Old World was irrelevant to the United States, what was he doing in that Roman café? Why did he exert so much effort, time, and treasure crossing the Atlantic at all? And why did he strain to deny any connection between the United States and Europe? This book provides answers to those questions.

McCall likened Americans in Paris in 1844 to swarming insects. That image would hardly have seemed appropriate from the perspective of fifty years later, when nearly one hundred thousand Americans regularly crossed the sea in

posh steamships to enjoy a tour of Europe. In the 1840s, roughly seven to nine thousand Americans crossed the Atlantic every year. Nevertheless, McCall's language did accurately represent the spectacular growth of American travel to Europe since independence. No reliable statistics for the colonial period or early nineteenth century exist, but the number of American travelers, as well as their share of the population, was surely small. One careful study of American travelers to Great Britain between 1740 and 1776 identified just over one thousand individuals, nearly all elite white men. Another analysis estimated that just over five hundred American men resided at some time in London between 1770 and 1775. Travel intensified after independence, although international war, expense, and shipping limitations kept the numbers relatively low. The best estimates are that, before the end of the Napoleonic Wars, no more than two thousand Americans traveled overseas in any given year. In certain years the number may well have been half of that figure.[2]

Travel abroad accelerated after 1820, the date at which reasonably accurate conjectures can begin to be made. Between 1820 and the Civil War, the number of Americans traveling on the seas rose at an annual rate of 6.7 percent, although it did so unevenly. In 1821, about 2,100 Americans visited overseas destinations, the vast majority of whom sailed to Europe.[3] By 1850 that number had more than sextupled. In 1825, a little less than seven hundred Americans registered in Paris lodgings. By the spring of 1848, Americans were entering Paris at the rate of three hundred per month. On the eve of the Civil War, nearly thirty thousand Americans traveled on the seas, about 90 percent of whom were headed to the Old World. The number of travelers spiked in the late 1830s and then again after 1849. Even so, travelers as a percentage of the overall population of the United States remained very small: about 0.02 percent in 1821, 0.06 percent in 1850, and 0.09 percent ten years later. That figure increased gradually, dipping only in the 1830s; by 1880 it had risen to 0.11 percent (for some perspective, in 1999 almost 9% of Americans visited a foreign destination). Although it is impossible to know how the social class profile of travelers evolved, it did diversify considerably in terms of gender. Overall, women constituted 10–20 percent of antebellum travelers, but their share increased sharply over the first half of the nineteenth century, perhaps accounting for 30 percent of passengers during the 1840s. As overseas travelers, women did not achieve parity with men until after 1950.[4]

Most of the passengers on transatlantic ships were tourists. People traveling exclusively for leisure made up a substantial minority of passengers. However, Americans made the most of their overseas experiences. Business travelers

often took the opportunity to make at least a modest tour of the region they visited, and many went much farther afield. Likewise, diplomats crossing the Atlantic seldom confined themselves to their posting. Often traveling with their families, businessmen and diplomats leapt at the opportunity to take in some of the Old World. A voyage to Europe was too special an occasion to devote exclusively to work. As a result, about nine in ten transatlantic travelers went abroad at least partly to engage in tourism.[5]

The rise in American travel to Europe was not the result of a surge in interest. The will had always been there; it simply awaited the means to accommodate it. Between 1750 and 1870 the vast majority of free, white Americans traced their ancestry to Europe. Additionally, American culture—to the extent it existed independently at all—was an offshoot of Europe's. Some Americans visited because, like Harry McCall, they claimed to be repelled by the Old World. Most cultured Americans frankly admitted that the United States was a descendant of Europe, the westernmost site of Western civilization. James Jackson Jarves, urging his readers to keep faith in Italian republicanism after the fall of the 1849 Roman Republic, reminded Americans that they were but "transplanted Europeans." Aside from simple population growth, which would have generated more travelers in its own right, more and more Americans visited Europe because it became increasingly easy to do so. Passenger fares declined slightly, particularly with the introduction of second-class fares in the 1850s, but they remained fairly steady over time. The jump in American overseas travel occurred chiefly because of rising incomes and because the ease, comfort, and convenience of travel improved substantially over the first half of the nineteenth century.[6]

Even a modest European tour in this period was extraordinarily expensive. The ocean passage was by far the single greatest portion of that cost. A three-hundred-dollar round trip was typical until the 1850s.[7] The first American-published guidebook (1838) estimated that a frugal traveler should budget at least $821 for a seven-month tour and cautioned readers that it was possible—even likely—to spend far more. In that year a common laborer in the Northeast made eighty-eight cents a day, on average. A clerk might earn forty dollars or so a month. The expense of a European journey put it out of the reach of all but the wealthy. As incomes expanded in the early nineteenth century, however, overseas travel came within the grasp of a larger share of Americans.[8] Perhaps more importantly, a variety of developments made transatlantic travel more accessible. Shipping improved considerably—not so much in safety, which had long been established, but in regularity and to a lesser extent in speed and comfort.[9] The Black Ball Line, with regular service between New York and Liverpool, was

introduced in 1818. Imitators soon followed. Utilitarian little ships, the packets accommodated ten to twenty passengers in small berths. Fares included food and sometimes wine and other beverages. They made the passage to Europe in about three weeks and the return in five or six, although the variations could be extreme due to the weather. The American steamship innovator Junius Smith endured a fifty-four-day passage from England to New York in 1832.[10]

Transatlantic steamships, introduced in 1838 when the *Great Western* established service to New York, were far speedier than packets. The Cunard line between Boston and Liverpool averaged thirteen-day westbound crossings in the 1840s. The steamships were noisy, dirty, and prone to fire and mechanical mishaps. Several of the early steamers went down or were sunk in collisions. Nevertheless, their speed and regularity made them a favorite with travelers. Seeming to annihilate the spatial distance between the Old and New Worlds, steamers also telescoped cognitive space. They made a transatlantic excursion thinkable for Americans who would not have risked the discomfort and inconvenience of a sailing vessel.[11]

Travel abroad became less inconvenient in other ways, as well. The establishment of regular shipping schedules, with posted fares, transformed booking one's passage from a scramble into a stress-free routine. The proliferation of guidebooks, particularly the in-depth, constantly updated volumes published by the London house of John Murray, took the guesswork out of long-distance travel. Marianna Starke's travelogues—guidebooks disguised as personal travel accounts—were especially popular with women. These publications provided railroad and carriage schedules, the locations of hotels and their rates, detailed route suggestions, passport and consular advice, and information on sites of local interest. Putnam's guide for Americans appeared in 1838, and Roswell Park's *Hand-Book for American Travellers in Europe* was published in 1853. Guidebooks allowed travelers to plan their own itineraries, freeing them from the necessity and expense of hiring local cicerones (usually called *valets de place*). Instead of being dependent on these hirelings to arrange their sightseeing schedule, negotiate with local businesses, and see to meals and the innumerable other details of day-to-day life in foreign countries, guidebooks empowered visitors to do most of this themselves—and enabled them to save time and money in the bargain.[12]

Other crucial services improved or developed anew. Among the most important were financial instruments that made it much easier for visitors to access credit while abroad. Letters of credit between Anglo-American banking firms and European banks became routinized in the 1840s. Although similar instru-

ments had long been in use, in earlier periods their issuance was limited to the rich and well connected. During the nineteenth century, the rise in travel made it profitable, or merely a good business practice, for banks to offer this service on a routine basis. By reducing the cost of fund transfers, letters of credit helped increase the volume of transatlantic travel. Bank offices also provided other services, such as English-language newspapers and mailing privileges. Bankers even vouched for travelers in need of passports or legal help, thereby acting as "adjunct consulates." In various ways, innovative banking services helped lessen the anxiety of overseas travel.[13]

Going overseas became easier, cheaper, and more comfortable as it became like any other commodity. Visitors to Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries faced enormous inconveniences. Travelers had to see to every aspect of their tour themselves in lieu of services that the women and men of the 1850s and later took for granted. Quite apart from the cramped, slow, and frightening ships, bad food, flea-infested inns, language barriers, wars and revolutions, and financial uncertainties, travelers had to plan their own route, secure their own sea and land transportation, and deal with unpredictable, ever-changing passport regulations. Guidebooks took pains to draw travelers' attention to this last point lest they find themselves confronting border guards and customs agents without the proper authorizations—especially if they intended to visit Austria. American diplomats were constantly badgered by travelers who had failed to get the necessary permissions at consular offices in New York or London. The self-generated nature of early modern travel made a voyage to Europe exciting and unpredictable. It attracted adventurous souls, but it discouraged travel by families, women, and less well-connected people. The commodification of travel, which included the establishment of regular water and land lines, detailed guidebooks, hotels with fixed rates, and even package tours, made tourism less spontaneous but also more safe, secure, and accessible. It allowed overseas travel to evolve from a pastime of privileged young men into one available to ordinary people.[14]

Why did these people travel to Europe, and what sense did they make of their experiences? In the space between Harry McCall's curt dismissal of Europe and James Jarves's affirmation of Americans' European roots raged a debate about the meaning of Europe for the fledgling United States. This argument has a long history. It is still going on, if the uproar over Donald Rumsfeld's 2003 rebuff of "Old Europe" is any clue. In early America, that contest included controversies over grammar and spelling, manners and gentility, national literature,

and history. Travel was at the center of these arguments, and so, then, were travelers. After the Revolution, Noah Webster admonished Americans to cultivate love for their own country and to develop a culture separate from Europe's. Young Americans could not help but be beguiled by the majesty of European courts, he feared, so it was better that they not see them at all. But they went anyway, and they argued with Americans like Webster—and each other—about how the United States should situate itself internationally. Essentially, Americans abroad put themselves on the front lines of a struggle about the place of the United States within Western civilization. People at home engaged with this issue, but visitors could not escape it. Travel thrust the issue upon them. William L. Vance has observed that American travel writing about Rome amounts to a discussion, "often rising to a vigorous debate," about what Rome told Americans about themselves. Americans in Europe wrestled with that question on a continental scale.[15]

Europe confronted visiting Americans with a few core questions they had to answer before they could determine their place in the Atlantic World. How should they deal with Great Britain? Was she the new nation's enemy, friend, or partner? How could overwhelmingly Protestant Americans look upon Catholicism as anything else than a system at war with national ideals? What could Americans do to accommodate some features of aristocratic culture to their republican society? In what ways could Americans promote liberal movements in the Old World—if they should do so at all? Resolving those dilemmas required Americans to face the more fundamental problem of balancing national distinctiveness while linking themselves to the European community. Lurking behind these problems was an even more troubling one—so troubling and basic that few travelers faced it at all. How well could they understand foreign societies? Could travel be transformative, or were Americans—like all travelers—more or less trapped by their own preconceptions and prejudices?

These questions engaged many Americans, not merely travelers. Well after the Revolution, women and men found it hard to resist the temptation to use Europe—especially England—as a foil against which to create a new national identity. "We have no *record* of Americanism and feel its want," George Templeton Strong observed in the 1850s. The compulsion to develop a sense of nationalism following independence gave rise to an especially prickly and belligerent patriotism. Foreign visitors found themselves besieged by demands that they endorse Americans' inflated sense of their national greatness. Alexis de Tocqueville claimed that transatlantic travelers carried this unattractive quality to the extreme. The American went abroad "with a heart swollen with pride," he

wrote. Americans responded indignantly when their hosts refused to flatter their national vanity. Travelers seeking to define the United States as a nation within the western European community had to negotiate the shoals of American exceptionalism.[16]

To get at how Americans tried to situate themselves within Western civilization, this book examines the views of the obscure, and largely forgotten, women and men who visited Europe between 1750 and 1860. It draws on unpublished diaries and letters and lesser-known published works. Travel writing was a lucrative pursuit for famous figures such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and Bayard Taylor. This book does not explore the views of these celebrity travelers—not because they lack interest, but because they have received ample attention elsewhere, and because manuscript sources and lesser-known works have been understudied.[17] Diaries and letters are also more candid than published sources. The conventions of private writing did not permit total openness—especially about salacious subjects or morally dubious practices like gambling—but publishing imposed stricter restraints on authors, especially famous ones. The travelers considered here were not representative of American society. They tended to be wealthy, white, English, male, and eastern, although the profile of travelers diversified considerably by the 1830s. Despite these qualifications, their writings provide an unparalleled perspective on how Americans defined themselves within and against Europe in the formative period of national identity.

An era of American travel ended in 1861, so this book ends there as well. The Civil War severely curtailed overseas travel. And when Americans resumed their prewar practices, they found that Europe was in the midst of significant changes. The unifications of Italy (1870) and Germany (1871) opened up Europe. After the Franco-Prussian War of 1871, Europe experienced a long period of sustained economic growth. Railroad lines spread throughout the Continent, opening up previously isolated regions to eager Americans.[18] Parallel developments took place on the seas. Late nineteenth-century steamboats quickly evolved into luxuriously appointed crafts. By the 1890s ships devoted exclusively to passenger travel were making the eastward passage in six days. Second-class cabins made fares affordable to ordinary people who were more interested in getting to Europe than the voyage itself.[19] Those developments led to a surge in the number of Americans visiting Europe—and in the volume of their writings. Attracted by low fares and the affordable rates for meals and accommodations negotiated by firms like Cook & Son, Americans truly swarmed over Europe

after 1870. In 1861, just over twenty-four thousand Americans crossed the Atlantic. In 1880 over twice as many did so, and by 1900 that number had risen to one hundred and twenty-five thousand. These Americans were also different. They had been changed by the Civil War. More secure in their national identity, Americans approached Europe more confidently than they had heretofore.[20]

In the decades before 1860, Americans were extremely anxious to situate themselves within the European community of nations. They disagreed sharply over the terms of that connection. How could they make cultural peace with Great Britain? Could and should they accommodate their Protestant culture to recognize the value of the Catholic Church? How could they maintain their identity as a republican people in an aristocratic world? Travelers were better situated than other Americans to weigh in on those questions. We still live with the consequences of the answers they reached.

"English association"

1750–1783

Like many colonials, Benjamin Franklin had mixed feelings toward Great Britain. He had nothing but praise for English culture, Protestantism, and the common law. He hoped that Britain would not oppress the colonies but, "like an affectionate parent," nurture their liberty and prosperity. Yet Franklin feared that the very features that made him proud to be British—Protestant faith, political liberty, and commercial prosperity—were in decline across the Atlantic. The "prevailing corruption and degeneracy of your people," Franklin told an English correspondent, seemed to be on the rise during the 1750s. He worried that British traits might not survive in Britain itself, but he was sure that the provinces would maintain them. As colonial Americans grew alarmed at the direction of British society, they reaffirmed allegiance to the attributes of Britishness. They developed an appreciation for provincial life, but not because it was turning them into something new. Rather, life on the Empire's margins allowed colonials to enjoy the best features of its civilization while shielding them from its flaws.[1]

The first stirrings of independence grew out of a sense that the English saw provincials as their inferiors. As tensions mounted, colonials strained to demonstrate their worthiness to be treated as equals by reaffirming their allegiance to British ideals. At a 1766 award ceremony honoring essayists charged with exploring the benefits of Anglo-American union, William Smith of Philadelphia explained that "Civil Liberty, the Protestant Religion, the principles of Toleration, in their purity . . . subsist but in few places of the globe; and *Great Britain* is their principal residence." John Morgan echoed Smith, praising the "noble spirit of freedom, which actuates the *Englishman*." He called the audience's attention to "the amazing increase of riches and power" that Britain and the colonies derived from commerce. The speakers hoped that their sentiments would be seen as American contributions to repairing the damage the Stamp Act controversy had done to the "mutual confidence" between Britain and her colonies.[2]

Colonists feared that laws like the Stamp Act demonstrated that the English saw them as subjects instead of partners in the advance of British civilization. Francis Hopkinson, another contributor to Smith's essay contest, agreed that commerce, freedom, and Protestantism were uniquely advanced under the flag of Great Britain, which flew as proudly over Philadelphia, Charles Town, and Boston as over London. "Are we not one nation and one people?" Hopkinson asked. "We of *America*, are in all respects *Englishmen*, notwithstanding that the *Atlantic* rolls her waves between us and the throne to which we all owe allegiance." British actions that seemed to belittle colonials provoked a variety of responses, from reaffirmations of loyalty to King and Parliament to arguments about the superiority of the colonies to the corrupt Old World. Increasingly, provincials argued that the colonies more perfectly embodied British ideals than Britain itself.[3]

Franklin, White, Morgan, and Hopkinson were not merely observers of imperial relations. They were experienced travelers with personal knowledge of Britain and the Continent. Their travels gave them an especially sophisticated perspective on British identity, which was defined partly against the nations of the Continent, especially France. Visiting Britain enhanced travelers' appreciation for life in the colonies. John Morgan knew he might obtain fame and honor if he elected to remain in Europe, Samuel Powel told a friend, but he was returning to Philadelphia because "his Amor Partiæ maintains an upper hand." Yet travel abroad also reinforced provincials' British nationalism. They could personally testify to the merits of British society, and if they had crossed the Channel they could speak to Britain's virtues vis-à-vis the Continent. They concluded that Americans benefited from access to the metropole, while the Atlantic insulated them from its imperfections. Even when they came to favor independence, travelers were reluctant to sever their emotional ties to Great Britain. The well-traveled South Carolina patriot Ralph Izard blamed English "bully[ing]" for colonials' anxiety in the early years of the Revolutionary crisis. Yet he maintained that "the inhabitants of America . . . look upon their descent from Englishmen, and their connection with England, as their greatest glory and honor." Colonial travelers established a pattern of American ambivalence to Great Britain that would last well into the next century.[4]

The Grand Tour Ideal

Colonial Americans traveled to Europe for a variety of reasons. Some did so for business or education, and others traveled exclusively for pleasure. Most com-

bined work with leisure. Americans were powerfully drawn to the English tradition of the Grand Tour. Its roots lay in the seventeenth century, when continental travel became the crowning educational achievement of young English gentlemen. For a year or more, young aristocrats would tour the public buildings, churches, and museums of the Continent under the supervision of a tutor who possessed mastery of art, history, and a variety of European languages.[5] Ideally, young men would carry letters of introduction granting them access to courts and polite society. The tour aimed to develop their minds and manners by exposing them to sophisticated circles in France and Italy. It broadened their horizons by allowing them to speak to men of affairs and refined women from different cultures, and it gave them more sophistication than those who lacked the wealth or social contacts to travel. During the eighteenth century, the practice of touring Europe became less exclusive. The gentry and wealthy men of middling status began spending a few weeks or months on the Continent, usually without the servants and posh accommodations of aristocratic Grand Tourists. Few mainland colonists could engage in a full-fledged Grand Tour. Nevertheless, in visiting Europe, young Americans laid claim to a deeply aristocratic strain of British identity.[6]

Colonial men found the ideal of the Grand Tour to be extremely compelling. Jonathan Belcher, a young Massachusetts Puritan, justified his 1704 tour of Holland and Hanover with a sentiment that might have been lifted from a British courtesy book: "A man without traveling Is not altogether Unlike a Rough diamond, Which Is unpolish't and without beauty." Nearly six decades later, Charley Carroll of Maryland used nearly identical language to convince his stingy father to approve his plans to visit the Continent. "The knowledge of man and of the manners of different countries polishes and improves the understanding," he told Charles. James Logan of Philadelphia also alluded to courtesy literature when in 1720 he observed that "to send youth abroad into the World is the most often tried way to improve them in the knowledge of it." That a Puritan, a Catholic, and a Quaker could each endorse European travel in such conventionally genteel language testifies to the allure of British aristocratic culture among the colonial gentry.[7]

Though a tour of the Old World would have seemed like mere idleness to the vast majority of Americans, it was serious business to those who undertook it. Exposure to men of affairs taught youths about the exercise of power. Meeting powerful people facilitated relationships that might blossom into political and commercial contacts. Ezra Stiles told Benjamin Franklin that he hoped that Henry Marchant's travels would expose him to "the Manners, Policies, and Spirit

of Government" in diverse parts of Europe so that he might "lay a foundation of his greater Usefulness & Figure of life." Even the intangible and seemingly ornamental features of the Grand Tour, such as appreciation for art, architecture, and music, enhanced the traveler and his family. The ideal of personal cultivation made famous by Philip Dormer Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield, was enormously attractive to gentlepeople, and even the nascent middle class found his advice alluring. Gentility did not come from inner virtue, as "respectable" nineteenth-century writers would maintain. It was both a reflection of and a tool for power.[8]

The gentry valued transatlantic travel partly because they did not believe that genuine refinement could be acquired in the colonies. The Scottish-born physician Alexander Hamilton thought that "ignorance of the world . . . which indeed is the case with most of our aggrandized upstarts in these infant countries" limited provincials to the veneer of refinement. True cultivation could only be acquired by travel, by observing the different ways of life in Europe's "polite nations." Though Hamilton believed colonials to be in denial about the level of their civilization, it is clear that many Americans were deeply insecure about it. From London, Edward Shippen told his brother Joseph that Americans had no conception of "how much we are excelled by those in Europe." The very hunger for improvement that propelled gentlemen like Shippen across the Atlantic might deter them from returning home. As a friend of John Singleton Copley explained, colonials who had been exposed to sophisticated circles abroad might be reluctant to return to the Empire's margins, where their influence was desperately needed. The result, he told Copley, was that "our Country is check'd in its improvement."[9]

The pursuit of refinement via European travel was inhibited by a number of factors. Britons traveled abroad to polish their manners, but most colonials abroad combined leisure with practicality. They crossed the Atlantic to obtain skills, contacts, degrees, and other things unavailable at home. Aspiring Anglican ministers had to visit London to be ordained since no Bishop resided in America.[10] Medical students studied at the University of Edinburgh, while law students read at the Inns of Court.[11] Young men sailed to England to study at English primary schools as well as at Oxford and Cambridge, and the proponents of American schools raised funds in Britain.[12] Those wishing to master the intricacies of trading across the Atlantic World apprenticed themselves to British merchant houses.[13] In addition to strictly practical concerns, colonials' blending of business and pleasure stemmed from disdain for aristocratic idleness. Though Henry Laurens paid homage to the importance of travel for aspiring gentlemen,

he ranked it well behind "an application to the business or profession," which "every good Man has, or ought to have in view."[14]

Because most colonials traveled for practical reasons, they engaged in sightseeing and sociability during spare moments. The South Carolina gentleman Gabriel Manigault explained to his grandmother that he looked upon his month in Bath as a respite from his legal studies. As Manigault's experience suggests, few travelers devoted themselves entirely to practical matters. Leisure was subordinate to business, but it was still of great importance. When in 1760 John Allen and Joseph Shippen, young Philadelphians, heard rumors of a sugar scarcity in Italy, they proceeded to Livorno with a shipment, hoping to score quick profits. But, as Allen's father explained to his business partners, they also grasped the opportunity to "see a little of the World." After settling their business affairs, they joined Benjamin West for a tour of Italy. Likewise, when Thomas Gilpin of Maryland spent two months in Britain in 1753, his object was to immerse himself in the mercantile world. Nevertheless, he toured the Lake District, Liverpool, and Oxford before exploring London. Colonials made the best of the opportunities presented to them. The benefits of leisure travel—gentility, authority, reputation—were too important to let pass.[15]

Colonial travelers also labored under financial limitations. Except for sugar planters and the wealthiest mainland colonists, the American gentry's wealth placed it on par with the prosperous upper reaches of the British middle class. Monetary constraints inhibited their ability to travel extensively. Of course, there were exceptions: when Charles Pinckney arranged the financing for the five years he spent abroad during the 1750s, he calculated that rent on his Carolina properties would secure him just under £700 of income a year. Nevertheless, even very rich colonists typically practiced frugality. Charley Carroll estimated expenses for a tour of the Low Countries on the very low end—£150—knowing his father might find even that too dear. Richard Ambler, a Yorktown, Virginia, merchant, bore the expense of sending two sons to English grammar schools in the 1740s and 1750s. Yet when his oldest boy asked for the indulgence of a short tour of the Continent, his father informed him, "The circumstances of my affairs will not permit me to be at the Expence of a French journey."[16]

Monetary considerations oftentimes reinforced moral qualms about the propriety of spending large sums on leisure travel. In a sermon written specifically for Jonathan Belcher before he embarked for Britain, Ebenezer Pemberton admonished that parents should wish that their children had "the Eternal *Jehovah* for a friend," not that they aspired to make an impression "on this Stage of Vanity." Moral reservations about travel to Britain did not signify a growing

gap between metropole and colonies—quite the opposite, in fact. Criticism of aristocratic luxury was a staple of British opposition literature, with which colonial readers were quite familiar.[17]

Besides corruption, colonials also feared the terrors of the Atlantic crossing. Tales of ships sunk in storms, captured by pirates or privateers, or dashed to pieces against rocks fascinated New World audiences. These stories, like one reporting how the body of a shipwreck victim had been discovered "with Tears froze from his Eyelids down the Side of his Cheeks," conveyed the dangers of the sea in lurid detail. Although such stories grossly exaggerated the frequency of disasters, ocean travel was a risky enterprise. When Devereux Jarratt sailed to England in 1762, a French ship closed on their vessel, and the crew pressed the passengers into service. One passenger manning a nine-pounder "looked pale as a ghost, trembled, and declared he could not fight even to save his life." Early in 1764, the ship carrying George Croghan, an Indian agent at Fort Pitt, found itself off Normandy amidst "seas running into mountains high," far from safe harbor. Terrified of going to the bottom, the passengers took to the ship's boats. Soon after they made land the *Britannia* dashed itself to pieces upon the rocks.[18]

While such incidents were increasingly rare, the occurrence of shipwrecks kept some would-be travelers at home. Despite William Strahan's reassurances that the danger of sea travel was "more terrible in apprehension than in reality," Deborah Franklin never overcame her fears to join her husband in Europe. Even those who had mastered their fears and crossed the ocean could hardly help but dwell on the perils of the deep. In 1777 Gabriel Manigault, a seasoned transatlantic traveler, related how his uncle, along with four other passengers, had been thrown overboard by a rogue wave and drowned during their voyage from Carolina to Holland. The Atlantic shaped colonists' conceptions of the Anglo-American connection in complex ways. If, as Strahan suggested, Atlantic travel facilitated the "communication and intercourse of far and different countries," the sea was, both literally and figuratively, a gulf between the colonies and the mother country.[19]

Finally, Americans' unfamiliarity with Britain complicated their wish to acquire gentility via travel. Colonials had only secondhand knowledge of the nation they called home. Unlike Britons, Americans' European tours had to begin with, and were often limited to, travel through England and—perhaps—Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. That fact alone distinguished British Americans from their fellow provincials on the far side of the Atlantic.[20] Besides the expense, Richard Ambler refused his sons' request to tour the Continent because he wanted them to "be made acquainted with our Mother Country," particularly

since he had seen hardly any of it himself. Colonials saw the Old World from an Anglo-American, not an Anglo-European, perspective. They were utterly unprepared for the antiquity of Britain, the scale of its public buildings, and the bustle of its cities. Even mundane activities took on exotic connotations, as when Francis Hopkinson, a young Philadelphian, bragged about feasting on a turbot, "a Fish highly esteemed," at a 1766 dinner party in Ireland. Yet the colonists' unfamiliarity with Britain should not be exaggerated. London's great structures—Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral, and the Tower—impressed Hopkinson. But, he noted coolly, "everything else comes pretty near what I imagined." While travelers' need to immerse themselves in the sights and sounds of the home islands underscored their provinciality, their British background eased the transition from colony to metropole.[21]

The Ambivalence of Being English

As Hopkinson's comment suggests, Americans arrived in Europe loaded down with expectations. They also crossed the ocean with an agenda. From travel literature, Americans learned that the highest duty of travelers was to discern the root differences between peoples by understanding national characters. Thus, travel was fundamentally a comparative enterprise. Americans went abroad with a British perspective. They did so consciously, as a way of demonstrating their Britishness to skeptical Europeans—especially the English. They were fully prepared to confirm the superiority of Great Britain to her continental rivals. But travelers also came to the Old World with a provincial perspective, of which they were only dimly aware. This tension produced much ambivalence about British society. To their surprise, colonials found themselves finding fault with many features of British life. Thus, travel was often a deeply disturbing experience for mainland colonists. To be sure, they found much to admire in England, and most travelers came home with enhanced pride in their English roots. But they also saw provincial life in a more positive light. Travelers sailed back across the Atlantic with a new sense of themselves as British Americans—safely distant from the corruptions of the capital yet fully enjoying the privileges conferred by the Empire.

Colonial Americans believed that Great Britain was the greatest nation on earth chiefly because of its Protestantism, liberty, and trade-based prosperity. They anticipated that this conviction would be confirmed positively, by what they saw in Britain, and also negatively, by the flaws they observed on the Continent.[22] Britons and Americans alike identified Protestantism as the chief

pillar of British nationalism. They believed that Great Britain was the nation chosen by God to advance the Reformation by doing battle with the Catholic Church. Also, Protestantism bound Britons—Welsh, Scots, and English—together as one people. It also linked the colonies to the metropole across a vast ocean. Likewise, Protestantism underwrote British liberty and prosperity. Linda Colley observes that "Protestantism was the foundation that made the invention of Great Britain possible." Colonials in Europe participated enthusiastically in that invention.[23]

Americans who traveled on the Continent expressed their nationalism via a wholesale denunciation of the Roman Catholic Church. Romanism's sins were legion. Travelers mocked Catholic doctrines as little more than superstition. John Morgan wrote that beggars in Loretto, a town north of Rome, pled for alms "as if all their Relations were in purgatory, & only to be redeemed from thence at the price of their beggary." In other ways the Catholic Church appeared to be hardly Christian at all. On Good Friday in 1776, Massachusetts travelers Katherine Greene Amory and her husband came upon crowds of worshippers prostrate in front of likenesses of the apostles in a Dieppe church. Offering prayers to crucifixes or statues seemed no different than paganism to the Amorys. Likewise, in Livorno Joseph Shippen found a shrine dedicated to the Virgin Mary that featured "pieces of old junk" from shipwrecks displayed, as he supposed, to demonstrate Mary's miracles on behalf of seafaring folk. Provincials echoed English charges that Catholicism went hand in hand with tyranny. Touring France during a break in his medical studies, Benjamin Rush concluded that Catholicism could only flourish where education and enlightenment were feeble. Hence, France, for all its merits, would never progress while Paris teemed with priests who were "the first and constant companions of each succeeding Prince."[24]

Americans believed that Britain owed its prosperity and liberty to its Protestant faith. Travelers frequently linked Catholicism with poverty. Using an image that would have resonated strongly with colonials, Francis Hopkinson observed in the country outside Derry "the most miserable Huts . . . much worse than Indian Wig Wams." His fellow Philadelphian Samuel Powel made a similar observation about Antwerp's environs. The countryside, though fertile, went unimproved because "the Ignorance of the lower orders" funneled wealth to the unproductive clergy. Protestants believed that their faith encouraged thrift, industry, and other wealth-producing habits. Catholicism bred passivity and submission to authority. Traveling from Basel to Strasbourg in 1772, the South Carolinian Henry Laurens noted that the towns were "mean & all Catholic except

one." Twelve years earlier, observing that Switzerland was divided into Protestant and Catholic states, Joseph Shippen claimed that "the Protestant Cantons are much the strongest most fruitful & extensive." Travel reinforced colonial Americans' association between Protestantism and British wealth and power.[25]

American travelers in later years also articulated strong anti-Catholic sentiments. Some went so far as to identity Irish immigration as a threat to the republic every bit as dire as a foreign invasion force. But antebellum Americans also expressed awe at Catholic ritual and art. That feeling was noticeably lacking from the accounts of colonial travelers, whose British nationalism could not accommodate the slightest hint of sympathy for Roman Catholicism. Rather, travelers reserved their admiration for the symbols of British Protestantism. Katherine Amory's feelings were "ravished with Wonder & Delight" upon visiting Canterbury Cathedral. Nathan Prince, a down-on-his-luck former Harvard tutor, swelled with pride when he first laid eyes on St. Paul's Cathedral as his carriage reached the summit of a hill giving a full prospect of London. "How I felt when I first see the cupola!" he gushed into his journal.[26]

Besides Protestantism, colonists emphasized two other features of the British nation: its affluence and tradition of political liberty. Anglo-Americans believed that Britain was a uniquely prosperous nation and that its well-being depended on its commercial enterprise. Similarly, there was a broad consensus—sharpened by the insecurity of living on a violent frontier—that Great Britain was the freest and most powerful nation on earth.[27] Travelers expressed amazement at British economic activity, particularly in England. Many travelers came from bustling commercial centers along the eastern seaboard, but nothing at home prepared them for the scale of English commerce. Everything around them seemed larger, faster, and more sophisticated than the commercial world they had known in America. London's economic life left more than one traveler nearly speechless. Entering the city for the first time in the summer of 1771, Thomas Parke remarked that he felt as if he were a "Stranger" rather than a British subject. Although he came from Philadelphia, the third-largest city in the British Empire, London nevertheless overwhelmed Parke with "the largeness of the place, the hurry in ye Streets & ye multiplicity of business that is carried on." England's power to startle was not limited to London. Colonials made careful study of manufactories in the industrial midlands. In 1779, Gabriel Manigault visited factories in Birmingham. One establishment amazed the South Carolinian by its capacity to produce "numberless articles" of metalware, all made "in the most elegant and accurate manner." As consumers of British goods and ardent nationalists, colonial Americans took great pride in the commercial enterprise of Great Britain.

Witnessing the engines of Britain's prosperity in London, Liverpool, Sheffield, and other commercial centers only intensified their wish to integrate themselves more closely into Britain's economic web.[28]

Colonials' wonder at Great Britain's economic development extended beyond its industrial districts. They were also impressed by the commercial orientation of English agriculture. Henry Drinker, a Philadelphia merchant, encountered "such pasturage as we are unacquainted with" as he rode through the Bristol countryside in the fall of 1759. John London, visiting from Virginia in 1776, described the country around Bromsgrove (about fourteen kilometers southwest of Birmingham) as "exceedingly pleasant, rich, & highly cultivated." He particularly admired the town's commercial infrastructure, especially its well-stocked warehouses and its wide stone bridge over the River Severn. England's commercial prosperity stood out in contrast to the poverty and sluggish pace of the economy in Scotland, where John London noted "the wretched appearance of the Cottages & little farmhouses." Many Anglo-Americans shared the antipathy to Scots so common among Englishmen. Even Francis Kinloch of South Carolina, for whom Scotland was "the land of my forefathers," was deeply critical of Scotland. The cultivation of lands north of the Tweed, he wrote, contrasted unfavorably to the English side. These feelings were not universal. Other colonials were much impressed by Scotland, a judgment that Americans would amplify after independence. William Robertson, a Virginian with close ties to his Scottish relations, saw little to fault about Scotland. In its agriculture, roads and commercial infrastructure, and the products of its manufactories, Scotland impressed Robertson as "one of the finest countries I ever saw."[29]

Whatever differences travelers had noticed between England and Scotland became insignificant when they crossed the Channel. Americans were startled by poor roads, endemic poverty, and urban ennui. Travelers found these conditions very selectively—mainly in France, Britain's traditional enemy, and in other Catholic nations. Benjamin Rush was the rare traveler to confront his Anglophile prejudices. Britons were "very apt to imagine every thing we see in our own country to be the standard of what is right." This was particularly the case with France, "a people whose manners are so very opposite to our own," that British people were compelled to "condemn them, above most nations of the world." Rush was right. Perhaps because they were anxious to demonstrate their Britishness, Americans' criticisms of France were gratuitous and mean-spirited. Even Rush, for all his self-awareness, was not immune. The French held industry in contempt, Rush charged, adding that "[t]he same sentiment prevails among the Indians."[30]

No inconvenience was too minor for colonial travelers to extrapolate into a general criticism of the French people. Gabriel Manigault endured rutted roads, crowded carriages, and unsanitary inns during a journey across France to Geneva during the fall of 1775. Complaining that these poor facilities oftentimes obliged him "to go without dinner, except eggs," he added that "the people in France are very dirty." Americans were far more critical of continental societies than contemporary Britons. Seventeenth-century English Grand Tourists vilified continental societies with relish, but eighteenth-century travelers were more even-handed. Their greater sense of national security, along with a shift in focus away from the Continent, toward the Atlantic, fostered a more cosmopolitan outlook. Colonists may have thought that denunciating the Continent demonstrated their Britishness, but it really served to draw attention to their provinciality. Englishmen would have agreed with Henry Laurens that London was preferable to Paris, but Laurens went too far when he dismissed Paris as "no more in comparison with London than Thames Street [an undistinguished thoroughfare] with Pall Mall."[31]

Colonial travelers attributed England's prosperity to its commercial orientation and Protestant faith. The Continent's poverty, they believed, proceeded inevitably from its retrograde society and the influence of the Catholic Church. George Croghan was struck by the maldistribution of wealth during a ride through Normandy in 1764. Although he passed many fine châteaux, the road was rough and the countryside underdeveloped. "Nine tenths of [the French] are Beggars and the most miserable Wretches that ever existed," he wrote. During his tour of northern Italy in 1760–61, Joseph Shippen discovered a level of underdevelopment that would have shocked him in a Protestant country. Ferrara was so bleak that he observed grass flourishing in its streets. Shippen's fellow Philadelphian, John Morgan, encountered Italian poverty at Loreto, a small town on Italy's Adriatic coast. In remarks that echoed Croghan's assessment of France, Morgan confronted the paradox that while Loreto's countryside was "pleasant, rich, and well cultivated, yet the people appear poor, abject wretches." Colonial travelers also expressed shock at the sight of European women engaging in heavy fieldwork, such as handling animals, bearing burdens, shoveling manure, and directing machinery. This was a common complaint among English travelers, as well. Arthur Young, exploring the area around Brittany before the Revolution, found women "furrowed without age by labour, to the utter extinction of the softness of sex," because they were driven harder than draft horses. English and American farm women worked the fields as well, but with the exception of enslaved Africans, the most physically taxing tasks were reserved for

men. Colonial observers on the Continent found the absence of a gendered division of labor to be a telling sign of European inferiority to Anglo-America.[32]

Travelers always compared Britain with the colonies, but they rarely compared the Continent with the colonies. Instead, provincial Americans compared the Continent with Britain. Perhaps they were reluctant to draw comparisons between places that had so little in common. Focusing on Britain as a foil for the rest of Europe was also a conspicuous way to assert one's Britishness. As Gabriel Manigault told his grandmother in 1777, "The bad accommodations I not long ago experienced in France served to sett off the small inconveniences in this Kingdom, and make them appear to greater advantage." Thinking of themselves as English ladies and gentlemen, travelers quite naturally adopted Britain as their normative standard. Being swarmed by beggars in Antwerp confirmed Samuel Powel's self-image as an English gentleman. Vagabonds knew how to "find out an Englishman," Powel explained, since they had a reputation for being free with coin.[33]

The manors and palaces of Europe also illustrated Britain's superior level of prosperity. Postrevolutionary travelers sometimes recoiled at great houses, the opulence of which was impossible to reconcile with republicanism. Colonials expressed no such reservations. To them, manors and palaces signified British wealth, power, and refinement. William Palfrey, a Massachusetts merchant, visited Blenheim Palace, the Duke of Marlborough's estate outside Oxford, in 1775. The "Grandeur of the rooms & excellent paintings by the most celebrated artists" awed him. Throughout the crisis with Great Britain—and even during the Revolution—colonials lavished praise on great estates. Benjamin Pickman, a loyalist exile from Salem who spent the Revolution in England, dedicated the late fall of 1780 visiting "magnificent Seat[s] of Noble Men" around Birmingham. Josiah Quincy, a Massachusetts patriot, was even more unrestrained in his praise for noble seats. He toured a number of great houses during the fall of 1774. After walking through Wilton House, the vast seat of the Earl of Pembroke, Quincy found himself at a rare loss for words. "My ideas were stretched with astonishment during this survey," he admitted.[34]

Colonial travelers took gentility very seriously. Its penetration into the middling ranks of society—as in Britain and the colonies—was read as a sign of prosperity and moral health. Its lack signified a flaw in national character. Thus, when Joseph Shippen complained that the orations he heard at the Doge's Palace in Venice were marred by "the most violent motions of the body . . . quick & sudden contortions of head & countenance . . . and a thousand other strange gestures," he was criticizing Venetian society, not merely its oratory. Gentility

manifested itself in many other places. Gabriel Manigault praised the gardens of the Prince of Condé for exhibiting "none of that regularity, which in most of the Gardens [of France] become tiresome." When he entertained John Morgan and Samuel Powel in 1764, Voltaire sought to impress his guests, who fancied themselves English gentlemen, by showing them his garden. It featured "no French Gewgaws," he told them. Like a proper English garden, it was more naturally laid out than the manicured French variety. Great houses were the most visible signs of national refinement. Travelers judged the palaces, châteaux, and castles they saw on the Continent to be inferior to Britain's. Henry Laurens was most impressed by the château of the Duke de Condé during the spring of 1773, yet he concluded that neither the houses nor the gardens "are to compare to those we meet at Noblemen's & Gentlemen's Palaces & Seats in England."[35]

American travelers paid close attention to various kinds of economic development in Britain and on the Continent. For the most part travel confirmed Anglo-Americans' preconceptions about British commerce and prosperity. They were stunned by the extent of economic development in England. Though unnerved by extremes of wealth and poverty unknown in the mainland colonies, travelers were convinced that England and, to a lesser extent, Scotland were distinguished by a general air of prosperity. The nation's great houses spoke not only to its wealth but also to its sophistication and good taste. Continental societies—France and Catholic Italy, in particular—seemed underdeveloped, poor, class stratified, and vulgar compared with Britain. Britons immodestly proclaimed that their prosperity raised them above other Europeans, but Anglo-Americans were positively emphatic on this point. Affirming the prosperity of Anglo-Atlantic civilization was an effective way for colonials to claim full membership in it.

Besides Protestantism and commerce, travelers also proclaimed the uniqueness of Britain's free government. Americans expressed reservations about Britain's political culture when imperial authority infringed on colonial liberties. Nevertheless, Anglo-Americans took pride in being part of the freest and most powerful nation on the globe. Travelers affirmed their links to British liberties by visiting important historical sites, military installations, and public buildings. They basked in the right and might of the British nation. They demonstrated their conviction of Britain's contemporary greatness by seeking audiences with the royal family or by participating in public ceremonies at which the royals appeared. Finally, Americans contrasted British and continental political cultures. Though colonials were sharply critical of Britain's flaws, they concluded that these seemed minor in contrast with the Continent's.

Americans were amazed by the sheer antiquity of Britain. Most travelers had read about castles, cathedrals, and the like, but the reality nearly always, as Katherine Amory wrote, "exceeded our expectations." Antiquity made the most prosaic objects and places exceptional. In the town of Bromsgrove, Virginian John London discovered a parish church whose "old fabrick" awed him. Inside the little church he found monuments to a local family dating back three centuries. To London, memorials of that age seemed "very ancient," but travelers found many far older curiosities throughout the island. Dover Castle, noted Isaac Smith Jr., dated back to the time of Julius Caesar. Visiting sites like these, travelers not surprisingly came to see the colonies as raw and unsophisticated in comparison to Great Britain. They seemed to lack any history of their own. When Josiah Quincy landed at Falmouth in November 1774, among the first objects he examined was Pendennis Castle, constructed during the reign of Henry VIII to protect the harbor of Carrick Roads. Viewing the landscape and the surrounding countryside from its sixteenth-century turrets, Quincy "was struck with [the] surprizing appearance of Antiquity."[36]

Travelers interpreted historical relics as signs of Britain's glorious past, but they understood that past to be directly connected to its contemporary greatness. When John Macpherson Jr., a young Philadelphian, toured Westminster Abbey in 1771, he felt that the "venerable pile . . . strikes its beholder with a solemnity not felt from other objects." Its historical associations, together with the requirement that visitors doff their caps before entering, intensified Macpherson's reverence for it. Sightseers were just as interested in modern developments as with past times. William Robertson, a Virginian, praised the remains of Roslin Castle, a fifteenth-century fortress in Midlothian, as "the finest Picture of Antiquity and Ruin I ever saw." He was also impressed by the economic innovations he saw in the neighborhood of Edinburgh, which included grand estates, artificial ponds with advanced irrigation systems, and excellent roads. By contrast, travelers argued that the Continent represented only antiquity. In the absence of the signs of modernity everywhere to be seen in Britain, continental antiquity signified only decay and stagnation. Ralph Izard indicted Neapolitans for their failure to excavate Pompeii and Herculaneum for seventeen centuries (by his count). "If such an accident were to happen to two cities, in any part of the British dominions," he maintained, "attempts would surely be made to uncover them in less than seventeen days." The relics of Italy's mighty past underscored its present-day degradation. From Britain's historical treasures, travelers saw an unbroken connection between the nation's past glory and its contemporary greatness.[37]

Colonial travelers venerated the history and political institutions of their mother country. Sightseeing at Britain's historical attractions forged a personal connection between themselves and the nation. The colonial gentry also visited shipyards, fortifications, and other demonstrations of Great Britain's military might. Richard Ambler allowed his son Neddy to determine the itinerary of his 1752 tour. However, he recommended that his travels would be wasted if he failed to visit shipyards so he could appreciate the might of the Royal Navy. Americans were proud of and grateful for the force of British arms. Parades and demonstrations, such as the review of a dragoon regiment that William Robertson saw in Musselburgh, a town outside Edinburgh, allowed colonials to affirm their identification with Britain. "I think it was one of the grandest sights I ever saw," the Virginian wrote of the 1771 review. It also impressed him with Great Britain's military prowess. "There can be nothing more dreadfull," he reflected, than to face a charge by mounted, sword-bearing men in their terrible red coats. Americans' conviction that Britain's armed forces exerted their might in the service of justice intensified their awe of British arms. "My ideas of the riches and powers of this great nation are increased to a degree I should not have believed," wrote Josiah Quincy after he toured the two-hundred-gun warship *Royal George* at Plymouth docks in 1774. Quincy was a bitter critic of the government's tax policies, but after seeing the *Royal George* he admitted that he would "with cheerfulness accede" to voluntary donations by the colonies if it would contribute to so worthy a cause as the enhancement of British power.[38]

As Quincy suggested, the colonial gentry revered Britain's mixed constitution. They believed it guaranteed personal liberties while securing national wealth, power, and stability. Travelers honored the king and the royal family as the most visible symbols of this system. Some colonials were well connected enough to secure personal audiences with the royals. Eliza Lucas Pinckney, daughter of the governor of Antigua and the wife of South Carolina's chief justice, was received by the royal family during her three-year residence in England during the 1750s. The warm greetings of the Princess of Wales seemed "pretty extraordinary to an American," she told a friend. In 1763 a self-effacing Samuel Powel boasted that "your humble servant" had been honored with an audience with George III to present him with an address from the College of Philadelphia. Benjamin and William Temple Franklin acquired much-sought-after tickets to Westminster Hall to attend the coronation of George III in 1761. Americans might be quite critical of British society and its relations with the colonies and yet harbor profound affection for the monarchy. Philadelphian John Dickinson railed at the corruption and vice he witnessed in London, yet he eagerly accepted Thomas

Penn's offer to secure him a royal audience. Though discomforted by George II's awkwardness—"he constantly cast his eyes on the ground," Dickinson observed—the young man cherished the brief time he found himself "in the presence of the greatest & best king upon earth."[39]

Only a privileged few could expect to meet the royal family personally. Most travelers, therefore, paid their respects at a distance. Francis Hopkinson's cousin, the Bishop of Worcester, secured him admission to the king's personal chambers in 1767. Hopkinson bragged to his mother that he "stood very near the King and quite close to the Imperial crown." The Philadelphian was so overawed by the royal presence that, after the king retired, he ran down to the street to catch one more glimpse of him driving off in his coach. In 1755, the South Carolina planter William Lowndes joined a company who had the honor of watching George II, the Princess of Wales, and several nobles dining. Most travelers could only see royalty from a distance, although that did not diminish their reverence for the monarchy. John Morgan and Dr. William Shippen joined a crowd outside Westminster Hall to pay their respects to Charlotte of Mecklenburg and George III at their wedding in September 1761. The grandeur of the ceremony awed the Philadelphians. "It is impossible by words to give any idea of the richness of the Coronation Robes of the King, the Queen, the Peers and Peeresses or of the august appearance they all made," Morgan wrote in amazement.[40]

Travelers also paid homage to the symbols of British liberty, especially the Houses of Parliament. Charles Carroll admonished his son that he would be "looked on as incurious & stupid" if he returned to Maryland without seeing William Pitt and the House of Commons. "We live in the world & ought to know it," Carroll instructed Charley. Travelers admired the Commons and Lords for the freedoms they represented. Although convinced that "the infernal Scheme for enslaving America" had been hatched in the Commons, Benjamin Rush was inspired to kiss its walls during his 1768 visit. That same day he trod on the "sacred ground" of the House of Lords and sat on the throne, which, he told a Philadelphia friend, he looked upon "with emotions that I cannot describe." Both the king and Parliament became symbols of imperial oppression in the mid-1770s, yet travelers venerated the symbols and personifications of the British state. Their esteem for the monarchy suggests how deeply royalist political culture was embedded in the colonies until the very eve of the American Revolution. Likewise, Anglo-Americans expressed reverence for Parliament, the embodiment of the rights of Englishmen.[41]

The merits of British politics became even more apparent to those travelers who visited the Continent. In 1758 Benjamin West had an experience that he

believed epitomized the differences between English and Italian national character—and the source of Anglo-American liberties. Arriving in Dover after several years on the Continent, West witnessed a scuffle between two young boys. The melee filled him with pleasure, he told Benjamin Rush, because in Italy "passion always descended into the heart . . . and vented itself only in poison or assassination." Fisticuffs between English boys signified "the revival of integrity, and of the open and honest operation of the passions." The episode represented manly British freedom distinguished from Italian skullduggery. Henry Laurens also found solace in British aggression, in this case the behavior of English beggars. French vagabonds, claimed Laurens, would slink away quietly if refused. A London beggar, infused with the dignity of the freeborn Briton, "seldom fails to give you curses if you give him nothing." Americans sensed that continental peoples' national character—the bundle of traits that distinguished one people from another—showed they were not ready for the burden of maintaining British freedoms. Virtue was a Briton. As George Croghan complained after a short stay in Normandy following his 1764 shipwreck, the French were "troublesomely complisant and Deceitfull not to be trusted."[42]

Colonial Americans found no parallels between the British monarchy and its continental counterparts. One was a defender of liberty; the others epitomized tyranny. During Benjamin Rush's 1769 visit to Versailles, he observed the Dauphin, who, perhaps self-conscious under the gaze of strangers, behaved awkwardly. His un-kingly conduct inspired Rush to wonder whether he had been "formed on purpose, to show the World of how little Value Crowns & Kingdoms are in the Sight of Heaven." Irrational and offensive as absolutism seemed to British sensibilities, travelers found evidence that it was consistent with French national character. Writing from Lyons in 1774, John Singleton Copley marveled at the demeaning hierarchy of France's class structure. "There is subordination of people in this country unknown in America," he told his wife. Ralph Izard believed that continental absolutism illustrated the superiority of Britain's mixed constitution. If the French were "slaves, and . . . there is no freedom in any state in Italy," Izard argued that it was because "the people have no check over the prince." John Dickinson believed that political freedom benefitted the British Atlantic World in innumerable and intangible ways. A contrast between results of simultaneous lotteries in England and France in 1755 proved Britain's superiority, Dickinson claimed. The French took six months to reach their goal, while the English lottery was subscribed in just five days. The episode illustrated for the young law student "the glorious effects of freedom & miserable consequences of slavery."[43]

Americans were not uncritical boosters of British nationalism. Travel confirmed Americans' Anglophilia, but it also forced them to confront some discrepancies between their expectations and their experiences. Britain delighted, but it also repelled; the Continent confirmed some prejudices but challenged others. Poverty, especially in the cities, contradicted assumptions about British prosperity. It seemed even graver—and less excusable—when juxtaposed against unfathomable levels of luxury. Americans also suspected that vice and sexual promiscuity were not merely tolerated but celebrated in elite English circles. Finally, Americans confronted the corruption of British politics, a disregard for the principles that supposedly elevated Great Britain above its continental rivals. Conversely, if Britain at times disappointed, the Continent pleasantly surprised many colonial Americans. Amidst its flaws they also discovered refinement, prosperity, and economic development. These revelations forced Americans abroad to reevaluate the colonies' place in the Anglo-Atlantic World. Travelers arrived at a new appreciation for their position on the edge of the British Empire. Their Anglophilia tempered, Americans developed a more sophisticated understanding of their potential place in a European—not merely British—Atlantic World.

From the gentry's worldliness to the strictness of its many religious sects, the mainland colonies were morally diverse. But all Americans were shocked by the depravity they encountered throughout Britain, especially in the cities. Francis Hopkinson informed his mother that she could have no concept of the variety of temptations set by the vicious population of London "to decoy unwary Youth into Extravagance and Immorality." For Thomas Parke, a Philadelphia medical student, the most vexing temptation was prostitutes lining the Strand "entic[ing] young Gentlemen home with them." Young colonials—far from home, flush with spending money, and usually free from supervision—were liable to be seduced by England's vices. As James Allen told a friend, "Americans are particularly remarkable for being wild & Extravagant." Worldly, genteel young men enjoyed the illicit diversions of London. In the late colonial period, however, colonials began offering a strong critique of English vice. Perhaps influenced by the "country" critique of British society, they began to imagine alternatives to the corrupt atmosphere of the English capital. Ebenezer Hazard, a Philadelphia traveler, raged that "Luxury, extravagance, & vice of almost every kind prevail in a very great degree" in England. Like other colonials, Hazard discovered that America had more in common, culturally, with Scotland than England. Unlike the English, Scots were hospitable, virtuous, and hardworking. Hazard concluded, "Compared with *London*, *Edinburgh* is *Heaven*." Americans

treasured their connection with England until the American Revolution. But, alarmed by its moral climate, they grew disenchanted with it and began to consider the merits of other parts of the Empire. As Hazard observed presciently, "Scotland has more of the appearance of America than England."[44]

Besides virtue, travelers expected to see prosperity and commerce in parts of Great Britain. They did not anticipate widespread poverty and suffering. Encountering these conditions deeply disturbed travelers, especially in England, where they least expected them. It undermined their faith in British nationalism. Robert Hunter Morris, who was in England lobbying with his father, was shocked by the servility of two workers he dined with in Chilworth. Morris understood why farmers on the New York frontier might live a hardscrabble existence, but that Englishmen would appear "not a bit better [than] countrymen usually do with us in America" contradicted his assumptions about English prosperity. Urban squalor amidst the wonders of London was even more jarring. The waves of alms seekers who hounded Samuel Davies during a 1753 walk through the city profoundly disturbed the Massachusetts divine. Beggars were so common that "one cannot Walk the streets without being pained with their Importunity," he wrote indignantly. For Josiah Quincy, the "obeisance and despondent" mien of the lower orders of people in England's southwest exposed the hollowness of British self-regard. "The Briton says, see France, Spain, and Italy, the calamities of slavery," the New Englander fumed. "The liberal minded who use a larger scale will think it not needful to go so far."[45]

English poverty seemed inexcusable not only because of the country's obvious riches but because it was juxtaposed with aristocratic opulence. After observing the "Nobility in their Shining Robes" surrounded by the poor during Queen Charlotte's 1765 birthday celebration, the Indian traveler Samson Occom concluded, "What a Difference there is and will be, Between God's poor and the Devil's Rich." Thomas Coombe, a Pennsylvanian Anglican minster, drew a similar moral from the pomp of a royal visit to Parliament. It represented, Coombe believed, "the Vanity of Human grandeur." Neither Occom nor Coombe had any sympathy with refinement and its worldly pretensions. But even those who did approve of the genteel ethic were scandalized by the extravagance of the English aristocracy. William Allen, well connected and Cambridge educated, recoiled at the dissipation he saw at the resort town of Bath in the early 1760s. Thinking of his children, Allen worried that exposure to this aristocratic world was unsuitable for Americans, "as it teaches them things that are fit only for those who have a great deal of money to spend." Allen's correspondent, Benjamin Chew, was inclined to empathize with his friend. In 1744 he had visited London,

whose fashionables he condemned for "deck[ing] thems[elve]s in all the Gaudiness of Shew & Pageantry." The American gentry thought they understood gentility. Visiting Britain introduced them to a side of fashionable life they had scarcely imagined. They did not like what they saw.[46]

Visiting Americans did not interpret the opulence of aristocratic life in the capital as a private vice. Rather, it stemmed from a moral malaise that seemed to pervade all English society. Influential people seemed not to be motivated by the public good, but stricken with a mania for enrichment and dissipation. "Interest indeed seems to be the Ruling Principle," Thomas Ruston said of London's great men in 1764. "Men are not Esteemed for their Merit but for what they have." Travelers were prepared for corruption because they were well versed in the literature of English dissent. But, like other aspects of British society, corruption made a stronger impression when seen in person.[47] British critics had long complained of the culture of corruption pervading court and Parliament. As provincials, however, Americans travelers responded to this corruption in peculiar ways. It enhanced their appreciation for living in the provinces, where the Atlantic shielded them from Britain's iniquities. In 1755, John Dickinson thought that the high number of disputed seats after a Parliamentary election represented "one of the greatest proofs perhaps of the corruption of the age that can be mentioned." Like many Americans, Dickinson believed the king to be above the moral pollution that pervaded Parliament and the courts. He was certain that George III had a "hearty affection for the wellfare of his people." But if the head of the British state was healthy, the body was wracked by disease.[48]

If Britain failed to live up to travelers' expectations, France and Italy sometimes exceeded them. Americans could find no merit in Catholicism or absolutism, but they were surprised to discover refinement and prosperity. It turned out that French taste was not hopelessly compromised by tyranny and superstition. Versailles awed Katherine Amory, who judged its Grand Gallery to be "perhaps the finest room in the world." Though Benjamin Rush had mocked the Dauphin for personifying the foibles of monarchy, he also believed that French châteaux were "more in number & more magnificent in appearance than any buildings perhaps in the whole world," far surpassing England's. In addition, the economies of France and Italy were notable not only for their crowds of beggars. Clear-eyed travelers found productivity and even well-being. Outside Lyons, John S. Copley came across "such fine prospects as no pen can describe," a beautiful landscape of châteaux, picturesque towns, and hillsides lined with grapevines. Joseph Shippen and John Morgan were sharply critical of Italy. They saw the baleful influence of the Catholic Church in its underdevelopment

and stunted cultural life. Nevertheless, outside Florence the pair declared themselves favorably impressed with the countryside, featuring busy villages, manor houses, and the landscape "improved & cultivated, with trees, grape vines, Gardens, & Fields." These observations hardly tipped the balance of colonials' judgments into favor of the Continent, but they showed that prosperity and commerce, at least, were not uniquely British conditions.[49]

Travel forced Americans to confront hitherto unimagined flaws in Great Britain. Disenchantment prompted some travelers to embrace their Americanness. In 1759 Jared Ingersoll told a friend that he anticipated his "return to my proper home . . . content to live and die among my American friends." Ingersoll's alienation from England was exceptional. Travel intensified colonials' identification with Britain even as they discerned its failings more vividly. It encouraged Americans to value their location on the imperial periphery. After several months in England in the 1760s, William Allen looked forward to exchanging its "pleasure and dissipation" for the "sincerity" of life in Pennsylvania. Exposure to Britain also laid bare some defects of colonial life. Americans had an inflated opinion of their husbandry, Josiah Quincy believed. He wrote of England, "The cultivation of the land can scarcely be realized by a mere American." Travel, then, allowed Americans to develop a complex identity as both Britons and provincials. They enjoyed the privileges of Britons while avoiding the dangers of life in the metropolis. This sensibility was nicely articulated by the Philadelphia gentlewoman Elizabeth Graeme. England was the preferred destination for those with an "unlimited Taste for pleasure," she wrote after several months abroad. But it was not such a good fit for those who sought virtue in this world, or salvation in the next. Britain had "its Sweets & Bitters," she concluded, a little unsure where she came down on the scale.[50]

Sociability and Provincialism

Americans did not cross the ocean merely to sightsee. They also expected to socialize. Considering they were Britons themselves, they expected that hospitality would be forthcoming. Travelers knew that their colonial origins were a handicap, but they also thought provincialism might give them an éclat that could open doors. Travelers hoped that sociability would link them more strongly to England, like sightseeing did. Yet complications ensued. As they attended parties and teas, colonials came upon women and men from other provinces. These strangers seemed oddly familiar: the Virginian and New Yorker, the Scot and the Pennsylvanian, discerned common patterns of thought and experience that

travelers rarely felt among the English. Additionally, English people disappointed colonial expectations. Colonials were told that they had strange accents, dressed out of style, and overestimated their importance in the Empire. These experiences changed travelers' understandings of their place in the British Atlantic World. They discovered flaws in Britain and surprising merits in home. Sociability in Britain planted the seeds of American identity in travelers who had wished to bind themselves closer to England.

Despite incurring considerable trouble and expense to cross the Atlantic, colonials enjoyed, and even sought out, each other's company while in the Old World. At home, Americans made few contacts across colonial borders. With the exception of certain professions, such as merchants engaged in the coastal trade, colonials were far more likely to encounter each other in Europe than they were on their own side of the ocean.[51] During his 1771 journey to Scotland, Virginian William Robertson was dispatched by his relations to squire around a West Indian family visiting the area. He showed them the lions of the country around Glasgow, like a new bridge and a flatware factory. He especially liked escorting the women of the family to teas and walks in local gardens. During their time in Rome in 1764, Samuel Powel and John Morgan joined John Apthorp and Thomas Palmer from Massachusetts. The four secured the services of James Byrnes, the resident Scottish antiquary, to escort them around the city's gardens, churches, and art galleries.[52]

Rich, well-connected provincials discovered they had much in common with each other. Ralph Izard was sent to England at age twelve to be educated, attending both Hackney and Eton before enrolling at Cambridge. He made a wide acquaintance with men from outside his native South Carolina. The breadth of his circle is captured in *The Cricketers* (also known as *Ralph Izard and His Friends*), a painting commissioned from Benjamin West. The 1764 work features Izard along with his close friends Andrew and James Allen, sons of Pennsylvania's chief justice, as well as Ralph Wormeley, son of a Virginia planter, and a Mr. Beckford, identified as a Jamaica planter. Increasing uniformity among the colonies, especially at the top of the social scale, made these friendships possible. As the gentry became Anglicized, provincial differences eroded. Ladies and gentlemen began to recognize their similar interests and aspirations. They also began to notice important differences between the moral tone in America and in England. When John Dickinson and his Maryland roommate, Robert Goldsborough, prepared to take new lodgings at the close of Hillary Term in 1755, the pair "resolvd to remember that we are *Americans*, to live soberly & prosecute our business."[53]

These intercolonial connections were unusual. After the Revolution, Americans made a point of seeking out their countrymen from different states as a nationalistic duty. Clannishness was the norm in the colonial period, however. Travelers tended to move among a circle of acquaintances culled from their local attachments. The pattern is well represented in the journal of Charles Lowndes, a Carolinian who spent a leisurely year in England in the mid-1750s. Lowndes spent his days recovering from hangovers, receiving French lessons, loafing at coffeehouses, sitting for his tailor, and checking up on his friends. Nights he devoted to the theater, cards or backgammon, company, or all four, usually involving several bottles. These acquaintances were all South Carolinians, English branches of their families, and English business connections: a circuit of Brailsfords, Middletons, Rutledges, Draytons, Watsons, and Pinckneys. On a typical night, Lowndes dined at the Northumberland Coffee House with "a good many Carolinia[ns], Mr. Pinckney, Mr. Drayton & his son, Mr. Middleton, Mr. Abenron (?), Mr. Brailsford, Mr. Beresford, Mr. Atkins, & myself." Thomas Middleton invited Lowndes to spend Christmas 1754 at his family's estate. His traveling companions coming and going were Carolinians. This pattern was so firm that Lowndes made a special note of the single exception to it, a November evening when his circle dined with a North Carolina gentleman.[54]

There were solid reasons to limit one's circle to the familiar. It was more certain that gambling debts would be paid, embarrassing incidents hushed up, and bail forthcoming.[55] Traveling youngsters were more reliably entrusted to friends than strangers. In December of 1754, Lowndes's friend Brailsford dropped off young Arthur Middleton so that he could accompany the youth to his uncle's estate.[56] Letters placed in acquaintances' hands were more reliably to arrive and be received, and news was received more swiftly and more surely, as when the Draytons summoned the colony of Carolinians to their lodgings to tell them about a terrifying Indian attack they had just learned about. Colonials were not misanthropic. They did not shun travelers from the other provinces. But without a national bond, they had little cause to seek them out, and good reasons for limiting their circle to the familiar.[57]

Colonials had compelling reasons for seeking out the company of their British peers. In the eighteenth century travelers tended to spend up to a year or more in the Old World, which would be very lonely if one did not mingle with residents. Travelers wished to socialize, but they encountered a variety of barriers. The moral tone of English social life upset some of them (it alarmed some Britons, too). Eliza Lucas Pinckney was scandalized by the universal habit of card playing at parties. Aristocratic extravagance struck others as immoral in light of

the desperate condition of London's poor. "The Wealth, Magnificence, & splendor of the Nobility Gentry & rich Commoners & the extreme Misery & distress of the Poor," William S. Johnson remarked, were "amazing on the one hand & disgusting on the other." Colonials also had inflated expectations of English social life, the reality of which inevitably let them down. William Shippen, a veteran of several Philadelphia assemblies, judged them far superior to English dances, such as the one he attended at Enfield in the summer of 1759. "We had 30 brilliant Ladies not handsom in general nor yet good dancers. A very disorderly Assembly no Regularity at all."[58]

The social life of Scotland seemed superior to England's. Welcomed into the home of the Earl of Leven outside Edinburgh in 1768, Benjamin Rush was delighted to discover a blending of gentility and Christian morality he had not experienced since leaving Pennsylvania. Considering what he had seen of the debauched ways of the English aristocracy, Rush could hardly believe his good fortune. At the earl's house he witnessed "noble manners united with a public profession of religion. Order, virtue, innocence, and friendship reigned throughout every department of the family." Even more to his surprise, Rush found French society far superior to England's. In this case Rush indicted English attitudes toward women. French *salonnières*' ability to converse about geography, philosophy, and belles lettres struck him forcibly as an improvement over English women's lack of learning. English gentlewomen seemed altogether superficial and uninteresting compared with their French counterparts.[59]

Such experiences hearkened back to the simpler ways of American sociability. While enjoying springtime in London in 1764, William Allen confessed to his friend Benjamin Chew that he "earnestly long[ed] to be at home." England was enjoyable to be sure, especially for the Allen daughters. But English politeness was tarnished by dissipation, unlike in Pennsylvania, where "we have full as large a share of sincerity. . . . Home is home, be it never so homely." To drive the point to its conclusion, Allen admitted that he looked forward to dining on "Buttered Indian Corn" the following summer. Allen redefined the colonies' shortcomings, epitomized by simple buttered corn, into virtues. There was such a thing, colonial Americans in England discovered, as too much civilization.[60]

Other Americans abroad echoed Allen in finding colonial foodways symbolic of the virtues of provincial society. After a year in London, William Shippen pined for home. When a Philadelphia ship arrived in November 1759, the young doctor could not wait for his favorite colonial delicacy to be unloaded. He helped the crew unload its cargo—Shippen was looking for the Pennsylvania apples—on the docks. Early the next month he "supp'd upon Philadelphia cran-

berry pie very fine." Peter Manigault, studying law in London, also craved delicacies that called home to mind. He thanked his parents for shipping him a turtle in September 1751, and the next summer he asked them to send some Madeira and rum. It was not that the budding lawyer had any trouble buying liquor in London (his parents had been alarmed to learn that he did so with ease, frequently). Rather, he explained, he wished to be able to entertain his friends "after my own Country Fashion." On the one hand overseas travel drew Americans away from familiar social habits into new and sometimes dazzling experiences, but on the other it brought them emotionally closer to home.[61]

The English did their part to drive colonials together. Sometimes they simply refused to be hospitable. John London discovered that the people of Bromsgrove were particularly enamored of bowling and cards and that—as in his case—"a stranger that cannot play, must not expect much society." Even well-connected travelers could find themselves without society. Gabriel Manigault shared a carriage with his friends John and Joseph Bucknell to Epsom for the annual races in 1777. But Manigault opted not to attend the race ball, having been told that a newcomer was unlikely to find a dance partner. These experiences drove travelers into the company of their fellow colonials. William Robertson bought an expensive suit of clothes for the king's birthday ball in 1771. But the only attendee he knew was as great a stranger as himself. His spirits rose when he spied a female acquaintance, but he discovered she had an escort. Dejected, Robertson left the assembly, but all was not lost. He walked to a tavern where he knew several Virginia medical students were meeting. "We spent the Evening very merrily & got well acquainted with each other," he reported.[62]

When they did acknowledge colonials, the English quickly revealed not only their ignorance of but also their apathy toward colonial affairs. They wondered how Americans spoke such fluent English, how they could live contently in the woods while in constant fear of Indian massacre, and how their morals were not corroded by slaveholding. Americans were not the only victims of English ignorance. Matthew Baillie, a Scot studying at Oxford in 1779, was "thunderstruck" to be asked by a classmate where Scotland was. Those kinds of questions revealed more than English unawareness toward the provinces. They suggested that the colonies were undeserving of notice.[63] In 1763, James Boswell met John Morgan in Rotterdam. Being in one of his periodical funks of depression, he accepted the Philadelphian's lead on a tour of Holland. In private communication with Johnson, however, he ridiculed Morgan as "a North American" and "un fat bonhomme." The English seemed to regard colonial Americans as curiosities, and semicivilized ones at that. As William Allen said of the great men

with whom he socialized at Bath, "It is Surprising to find how deficient they are in the knowledge of American affairs."[64]

These prejudices were not insurmountable, as the experience of Samuel Powel and John Morgan illustrates. Their identity as English gentlemen was sorely tested, but ultimately confirmed, by a number of crises during their 1765 tour of northern Italy—or so they chose to believe. Whether the English people with whom they interacted would have agreed is less certain. The first test occurred when the pair refused to pay bribes to local officials in Milan, thinking that to do so was beneath the dignity of English gentlemen. Morgan was confident that the city's common people would take heart at this example of righteousness meted out by "a Couple of English Men." That self-image received frequent reinforcement as the pair moved south. An innkeeper, hearing of their exploits at Milan, offered special hospitality to the "two English Men who had curb'd the Insolence of Fellows whom every Body feared and hated." Later, they graciously received the apologies offered by the cast of a play at Turin after a poor performance, a gesture directed at the whole audience "but particularly to the English."[65]

Italians' affirmation that Morgan and Powel were English gentlemen made their passage through Italy very agreeable. It seems not to have occurred to them that few ordinary people in Italy had even heard of Britain's mainland colonies. Europeans' inability to distinguish Americans from Britons was to have a long history. After the Revolution, it infuriated Americans as much as it pleased Morgan and Powel—who in any case did not see it as an error requiring correcting. But English people would not make this mistake. They would be able to identify Americans with ease, and they considered the colonial/English distinction to be fundamental. The first inkling of trouble came in Venice. Powel and Morgan dined at the home of John Murray, the English resident, and a large number of guests. Murray had paid host to William Allen, William Shippen, and Benjamin West the previous year. From their company the household had attained a "great Opinion" of their home city of Philadelphia. During the meal, the women "in a jocose way" proposed crossing the Atlantic to visit the city, according to Morgan. Perhaps unaware that their home town was being mocked, Powel and Morgan innocently promised to provide their new friends with hospitality should they decide to carry through on their plan. This was polite teasing of Morgan and Powel's colonial roots, but it was teasing nonetheless.[66]

The real trouble came when the two reached Turin. The travelers first stopped at the office of the English chargé d'affaires, Louis Dutens, to register. He received them politely, promising to call and to pass along to the authorities their

request to inspect the town's fortifications. Days passed with no word. Morgan sent a note to the minister, who replied that permission to tour the walls was only granted to visitors who had been presented to the king of Sardinia, a privilege neither Morgan nor Powel had received. They believed this excuse to be a pretext. They convinced themselves that Dutens did not see them as English at all. Perhaps having no letters of recommendation, besides "not being known to the english Nobility or Gentry," made them appear to be persons beneath his notice. Dutens's circumspection touched them precisely on their most sensitive point: their insistence that they were not colonial gentlemen, but English gentlemen. This possibility seemed ever more credible after Dutens drove to their inn to pay a visit to the English guests. Morgan and Powel waited two hours in their room before discovering that Dutens had made his calls and left. The Philadelphians concluded they had been snubbed.[67]

During their wait, the travelers experienced anticipation, then frustration, and finally anger. Morgan would not suppress the "Spice of Resentment" he felt at being "treated so ceremoniously." If Dutens did not think they were Englishmen deserving of notice, Morgan decided to make it perfectly clear that they were. In a note to the chargé d'affaires, he observed that he and Powel "had flattered themselves that English Gentlemen, who have been presented to his britannic Majesty in England, & to the Duke of York as well as other Princes in making their Tour through Italy," would receive permission to examine the city's walls. By this time the tour of the battlements was an afterthought; the real issue was to have their identity as English gentlemen confirmed. As Morgan pointed out, the privilege of seeing the fortifications was "usually conferred on every [E] nglish Gentleman, who, in making the Tour of Italy take Turin in their way." Dutens, perhaps just bludgeoned by Morgan's tenacity, elected to comply. He explained that he had believed the two "English gentlemen" were visiting Turin for just a short time and thus would not wish to be bothered by a royal audience. He made the arrangements. Powel and Morgan saw the fortifications. And they put the best possible spin on the episode. Dutens, Morgan concluded, had inquired at their bankers, who had confirmed they were "Gentlemen demanding his Countenance & Notice." Powel simply gloated that they had seen the fortifications, "a favor granted to Englishmen only."[68]

The adventures of John Morgan and Samuel Powel illustrate how desperate colonials were to lay claim to English identity, as well as how reluctant Britons were to confer it. For all their difficulties, the Philadelphians did attain their goals. The key, besides sheer tenacity, was that both Powel and Morgan had the wealth and connections to merit acceptance into polite society. Americans may

have complained about the dissipation of the English gentry, but they put aside those reservations when opportunity presented itself. Charley Carroll worried that his father would disapprove of his friends' card playing, but his father told him to conform to their habits.[69] Most travelers needed no such prompting. Peter Manigault declared, "I am no proud man, & Carolina is good enough for me." He swore that he would leave England anytime, as a "happy & speedy Sight of my Friends in Carolina would be the greatest blessing under Heaven." Strange, then, that whenever the subject of his return came up he told his parents that another year abroad would be "an infinite Benefit" to his improvement. Despite his preferences for South Carolina's food, weather, and women, Manigault admitted that "a Mug of Porter stands a poor Chance when I meet it, and I like red Wine better than Madeira."[70]

Americans with the proper connections did not hesitate to mingle with the great. Francis Hopkinson, John Dickinson, and the Izards enjoyed the hospitality of the Penn family. Elizabeth Graeme dined with Lady Juliana Penn and Charlotte Finch, wife of the Earl of Aylesford.[71] John Moultrie, a young South Carolinian studying medicine in Edinburgh, used his family connections to enter the household of Lord Haklet and that of Lady Haklet's brother, the Earl of Murray. As he reached adulthood, Charley Carroll entered the circle of William Graves, a graduate of Balliol College and the Middle Temple, with whom he toured the Continent. Graves's friends, Charley boasted, were "most of them Parliat. men, lawyers, [and] . . . men of sense." Charley's bills were correspondingly high, but he urged his father to excuse them since "it would be foolish & mean to decline their company on that account."[72]

Few Americans had those kinds of connections. They settled for less exalted company, which still seemed lofty by colonial standards. In the spring of 1775, Benjamin Pickman dined at the house of a member of the House of Commons from Aldborough. He lived "in a very elegant manner," Pickman wrote. He entertained Pickman with a multicourse meal, all of it served on the best china. Even those who had aristocratic connections spent most of their time in polite, but hardly exalted, society. Elizabeth Graeme, who dined with Lady Penn, felt more at ease with Britons of her own station, such as Dr. John Fothergill. His country house, at which he entertained a number of Americans, featured "the utmost neatness & Order," she observed. Colonial travelers enjoyed extensive access to the middling levels of the English gentry. Its upper reaches were closed to them—as they were for the mass of Britons. In early 1755, Charles Lowndes joined a crowd gaping at the remains of a masquerade ball at the Russian embassy. Lowndes saw perfumed waters in huge basins carved to resemble grottos,

ornate lighting, fountains, and a mock Roman Temple made of sugar, "in the middle of which sat the Empress of Russia on a Ball looking up at the Sun." This was the closest Lowndes, other colonials, and the vast majority of Britons would ever get to the highest echelons of English society.[73]

The standards for entrée into polite English society were more flexible on the Continent. Englishmen traveling in or residing there were quite hospitable toward Anglo-Americans. John Apthorp, the Massachusetts traveler, was a part of the Florentine circle around Edward Gibbon in 1764. In this foreign context Americans developed a deeper sense of the otherness of continental Europe and of their kinship with Britons. During 1774, John S. Copley discovered a "little English colony" in Avignon. He spent the better part of a week there "very happily indeed, in this English association." In northern Italy the following summer, amidst disintegrating Anglo-American relations, Copley reflected that he could not recall visiting anyplace on the Continent where he had not discovered and fallen in with a circle of English travelers. British social boundaries were more flexible across the Channel. The Prince of Wales invited Powel and Morgan to join his entourage in 1764, and they were "lavishly entertained on his Highness's account along the way." During his tour of the Low Countries in that same year, a South Carolina traveler received an invitation from the English ambassador at The Hague to attend the king's birthday ball. He enjoyed "English country dances . . . till broad day light." It was an exalted company whose quality he had not encountered "in the court of St. Jas. or any of the Balls at Bath, Soho-Square or any other place till now." Hospitality did not make Americans forget their reservations about England. The South Carolina traveler's enjoyment of the ball did not extinguish his disdain for "the formal stiffness of those of superiour rank." But hospitality between Britons and Americans, whether in Britain or across the Channel, drew colonials closer to England.[74]

The Material Culture of Colonial Travel

Leisure travel was expensive. The cost of an ocean passage, lodging, meals, transportation, and other expenses limited overseas travel to the rich until well into the nineteenth century. Besides the necessary costs of travel and sustenance, many travelers also purchased luxury items, from clothing to candlesticks, from portraits to relics of imperial Rome. This activity was part of the "consumer revolution" that swept through the British Atlantic World during the eighteenth century. Between 1750 and 1773, notes historian T. H. Breen, the colonial market for British goods rose 120 percent. A flood of goods transformed the material

life of Anglo-Americans. Some products, such as soap and cloth, replaced homemade items, while others, such as clocks, carpets, and silverware, became popular for the first time. Breen observes that these commodities helped Anglicize Britain's mainland colonies. Previously diverse and heterogeneous places became, in their material life, increasingly alike.[75] The significance of goods is not limited to their impact on daily life, however. Purchases are consumer decisions that convey deeply held values and aspirations. Traveling colonials' spending habits expressed their identification with the culture of English gentility.

Two kinds of discretionary spending were especially important to travelers: the purchase of goods to bring back home (such as portraits, artworks and relics, and furniture), and money spent to maintain a genteel lifestyle while abroad (servants, stylish clothing and accessories, French lessons). Only the second category is uniquely restricted to travel. English-made punch bowls, chairs, and even portraits could be imported from Britain, and they were increasingly available domestically. In 1754 James White, a craftsman recently arrived from London, appealed to Philadelphians on the basis of his ability to make household furnishings "after the newest taste," as well as fine men's and women's clothing "after the newest fashion."[76] In practice, though, items purchased abroad had a special éclat. Also, some goods were only available overseas. The great English portraitists had to be sat for in England. Travelers had access to a wider variety of goods than domestic shoppers. Lavish spending allowed Americans to behave like English Grand Tourists. Travel guides like Nugent's *Grand Tour* devoted much of their content to telling readers where to shop.[77] The demands of Anglicization were more intense and the choices richer in Europe than in America.

Travelers had access to items that were simply unavailable in the colonies. While in Italy, for example, Morgan and Powel employed Nugent's guidebook, as well as their local cicerone, James Byrnes, to steer them though Rome's antiquarian marketplace. Morgan shipped back to Philadelphia over forty plates and drawings. He also bought over a dozen paintings of classical figures, as well as many books, mostly Italian imprints but also a three-volume "Franklin on Electricity" published in London. His companion Samuel Powel also spent freely. During a 1780 visit to Powel's luxuriously appointed Philadelphia home, the Marquis de Chastellux took note of his many prints, including high-quality copies of the Italian masters Powel had bought in Rome and Naples. Joseph Shippen bought bologna sausages, vermicelli, and wines, and William Allen instructed

his son to return from Italy with Parmesan cheese, the best anchovies, and several cases of olive oil. These items testify to the significance of display in genteel culture, and how travel heightened the ability of those who could afford it to make the most attention-grabbing demonstrations of their refinement.[78]

Chastellux's appreciation for Samuel Powel's connoisseurship shows that the display of such items created an environment in which men of taste could identify each other. They were preconditions of cosmopolitanism. These consumer choices represented a wish to distinguish those committed to "cosmopolitan display" from those who practiced "self-conscious restraint." This sentiment was perfectly expressed by George Roberts, who implored his friend Powel, soon to cross the Channel, to "devote some hours to my service in France" by sending him "every article that's Modern." Ever since an evangelical revival ignited by George Whitefield's 1763 visit to Philadelphia, Roberts complained, the city had become boring and provincial. Dissipation had become unfashionable. "We are grown so queer that a foreigner would think his lot was cast among the worshippers of the First Age," said Roberts. He needed a shipment of European luxury to save him from the creeping bourgeois conformity of Pennsylvania.[79]

The most aristocratic commodities purchased by travelers were household furnishings and portraits. By midcentury, colonial cities were home to craftsmen capable of creating luxury household goods. They were much in demand among the status-conscious gentry, such as Philadelphian John Cadwalader. Though he never traveled to Europe, Cadwalader adorned his Philadelphia mansion with furnishings made according to the latest English styles by local craftsmen.[80] Yet some colonials wanted more. Aristocratic aspirations were more perfectly articulated by displaying items bought abroad. South Carolinians were among the most avid consumers of British-made luxury goods. John Drayton furnished his low-country mansion with a variety of English-made furnishings, some of which he ordered, others which he purchased during his 1756–58 tour of Britain, and still others which were likely purchased by his nephew, William Drayton, who toured Yorkshire with Peter Manigault and Daniel Blake in 1752. Miles and Mary Brewton shopped for furnishings for their new Charles Town house during their 1768–69 travels. Peter Manigault and the Pinckneys, Eliza Lucas and Charles, purchased many items, from candlesticks to teapots, during the years they spent in Britain.[81]

The colonial gentry sought portraits that would display their cultural and social authority. John Cadwalader commissioned a series of family portraits from Charles Willson Peale, a local artist who had trained in Europe. They portrayed

the members of the family amidst their rich furnishings, announcing to viewers their wealth and refinement. Wealthy travelers trumped Cadwalader by having their likenesses done by England's greatest practitioners of the craft—Thomas Gainsborough, Joshua Reynolds, George Romney, and William Keable. The frequency with which South Carolinians sat for these artists attests to their powerful sense of class entitlement and Englishness. In 1749, Thomas and Anne Loughton Smith sat for William Keable; in 1756, Miles Brewton was painted by Joshua Reynolds. Johann Zoffnay, a Frankfort-born artist who had trained in Italy, painted a full-length portrait of Ralph Izard sometime before 1765. His wife, Alice DeLancey Izard, was painted by Thomas Gainsborough, the most renowned portraitist of his generation. She also had miniatures painted by George Engleheart and Henry Spicer; Jeremiah Meyer painted a miniature of their eldest daughter, Margaret, in 1774. These works were remarkable not merely because they were executed by great British artists, but because they depicted their subjects as gentlepeople, dressed resplendently and often in classical poses, which alluded further to their good taste.[82]

The rice planters of the low country were not the only Americans to sit for English portraitists. Charles Carroll, commanded by his father to "get y[ou]r Picture drawn by the best hand in London, let it be a three Quarters length, let it be put in a Genteel gilt frame," sat for Joshua Reynolds in 1763. Reynolds portrayed Carroll enveloped in darkness, the contrast highlighting the young Marylander's refined demeanor and fashionable clothing.[83] Travelers did not limit themselves to English artists. Angelica Kauffmann, a German-born artist living in Florence, painted John Morgan, Samuel Powel, and John Apthorp. Some of the most remarkable portraits of Grand Tourists were executed by the American-born painters Benjamin West and John Singleton Copley. West, a Philadelphian, painted Thomas Middleton of the Oaks in 1770 and executed a group portrait of Arthur and Mary Izard Middleton with their infant son Henry in 1772, a work modeled after Raphael's *Niccolini-Cowper Madonna*. These works included some elements of Grand Tour portraiture, but they were more remarkable for what they omitted. Traditionally, Grand Tourists posed amidst a background of sculptures, monuments, or other well-known classical props.[84] The Grand Tour portraits of Americans were fundamentally different. Colonials occasionally appeared in fashionable "vandyke" dress, as in Benjamin West's 1770 portrait of Thomas Middleton. More often, colonials dressed more modestly and were framed less ostentatiously than British Grand Tourists. John Morgan wears a strapping blue coat in Angelica Kauffmann's portrait, but by having

Morgan gesture to a medical treatise by Johannis Morgagni, the artist stressed his useful knowledge rather than aristocratic connoisseurship. Kauffmann painted Samuel Powel contemplating a classical floor plan, a common trope in the tourist portraits of Nathaniel Dance. Yet, compared to the portraits of aristocratic British travelers, Powel's is uncluttered, restrained, and contemplative. Americans admired Britain's high society, but these portraits suggest they harbored moral reservations about aristocratic culture.[85]

This ambivalence is the theme of Copley's *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard* (1775), painted while the Massachusetts artist toured Naples and Paestum with the Izards. It portrays the couple within a symbolic environment that captured the complex meaning of the Grand Tour for Americans in the twilight of the colonial era. Their dress is rich yet restrained.[86] British tour portraits rarely portrayed married couples, but Copley's work shows the Izards engrossed in conversation. The couple contemplates a sketch of a sculptural group—Papirius and his mother—positioned behind them. In Roman mythology, Papirius, like the Izards, was compelled to choose between fealty to his mother (Britain) and fealty to his country (America). Pressed by his mother to reveal secret deliberations of the Roman senate, Papirius concocted a story designed to satisfy her curiosity without violating his pledge. The sculpture addresses the dilemma of conflicting loyalties. Papirius demonstrated his virtue by putting his country over his family. At the same time, the urn above Ralph Izard's head displays Leto with her children Apollo and Artemis. Niobe had boasted that her fourteen children provided her more happiness than Leto's two. Leto then summoned Apollo and Artemis to slay Niobe's family. This story stressed the loyalty of child to parent. Thus, Copley's *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard* provided no way out of the conundrum that bedeviled travelers like Alice and Ralph Izard, travelers who loved America and England equally.[87]

Travelers only spent a portion of their funds buying items to take home with them. It was one thing to become an English gentleman in a portrait, another to become one in England. Travelers learned quickly to conform to the standards of English gentility. Most of these adjustments required considerable expense. Even the most cost-conscious colonials seldom begrudged such spending. John Moultrie felt compelled to explain why, after several months in Edinburgh, he had not yet contracted a servant: "I am sorry to tell you that I have not got a young man. They all went away in the [Jacobite] Rebellion." William Allen wanted to be sure that his sons did not spend his money indulging in vicious habits, but he did not begrudge them £250 annually in spending money, so long

as they behaved with reasonable restraint. Charles Lowndes kept close tabs on his expenses, yet he hired an expensive French master whose appointments he kept dutifully.[88]

Like other colonials, Lowndes also spent lavishly on clothes. As the most visible sign of gentility, new clothing and accessories were indispensable. When John Marscarene arrived in England in 1761, his first priority was to acquire a tailor, hairdresser, and hat maker. With a flair for the dramatic, Elizabeth Murray proclaimed herself to be "a presoner until my cloathes are made." Charles Lowndes kept detailed sartorial records during his 1754 sojourn in London. On November 16, Lowndes's tailor brought some samples to his room; on the 23rd, the clothes, including some fine coats, were delivered, only to be sent back two days later for alterations in time for a planned Christmastime jaunt to Bath. As the date of departure approached, Lowndes also contracted with a seamstress for some fancy ruffled shirts. His slave, Cato, did not fare so well; Lowndes returned a parcel of his shirts because the fabric was "too good & dear." The South Carolinian also knew how to accessorize; among his autumn purchases were a fancy new wig, a sword, and a fine hat. Joseph Shippen also spent lavishly on clothes and accouterments during his 1764 tour, including a new sword in a decorative scabbard. Colonials had to conform to the latest styles as well as heightened standards of luxury while abroad lest they be dismissed as rustics. Johanes Preston, whose mother was a well-regarded Quaker preacher in Philadelphia, "adopted an extreme manner of Parisian dress and speech" when he studied medicine in France. His fellow Philadelphian, Samuel Powel Griffitts, sent his American-made watch back to his mother because it was too plain for Paris, where "we cannot expect People to value such Things for their intrinsic Worth."[89]

Peter Manigault's consumer purchases while abroad in 1750–54 epitomize how colonial gentlemen understood the significance of consumption. Although the Manigaults were one of the wealthiest families on the mainland, they insisted that Peter mind his spending. His parents readily acceded to Peter's requests for more funds since he promised that the money would be spent strictly in the pursuit of "useful Attainments"—which he defined broadly. He observed after a pleasure trip to the Continent in 1753, "Tis true I could live something cheaper than I do but then I must deny myself many Things which if you were here you would think but reasonable for me."[90] He spent lavishly on luxury items for his friends and relations. Soon after his arrival he sent via a friendly captain four expensive fans for his female relatives. With that shipment he also included several camera obscura prints and invited future orders, since London

shops teemed with them. He bought French porcelain—a rare commodity indeed in the British colonies—during his continental trip, as well as matching silver tea and sugar canisters in London. He sent home a number of magazines and books, including a new title "which has made a great Noise here" and thus would be all the rage in Carolina, Robert Dodsley's *Oeconomy of Human Life* (which Manigault wrongly attributed to Chesterfield).[91]

His most significant expenditure was the portrait he commissioned from Allan Ramsay in 1751 (now lost). Manigault rejected recommendations he sit for William Keable, the portraitist who had painted members of other wealthy South Carolina families. Manigault thought that Keable's paint "seemed to be laid on with a Trowel." Additionally, Manigault inferred from Ramsay's higher charges that he must be the better artist. He charged £24 for a portrait, while Keable asked for £7. Manigault's friends deemed it a good choice: the portrait "is accounted by all Judges here, not only an Exceeding good Likeness, but a very good Piece of Painting." He invited his parents to judge his lifestyle from the picture, since he stood for the artist in his everyday clothes. While dedicated to appearing genteel, Manigault had a very colonial aversion to aristocracy. His mother feared that he had become "too gay," but he told her that she could allay her anxieties by looking at his portrait, in which he was dressed elegantly, but not lavishly.[92]

Like other wealthy travelers, Manigault spent freely on goods necessary to adapt to life as an English gentleman. A mortifying incident in church forced him to buy an expensive suit, though one neither "foppish nor extravagant." His companion William Drayton, dressed in a "Laced Waistcoat," had been shown to a pew. Manigault, plainly adorned, was made to stand in the aisle during the service. He also appreciated the little personal details that signified refinement. Soon after his arrival he sought permission to purchase "a very necessary Article," though an expensive one—a new watch.[93] After he entered the Inner Temple, Manigault sought rooms appropriate to his station. He demanded "handsome Lodgings, fit for a Person of my Condition; & a Servant to wait upon me." He denied that this request was extravagant. Such accommodations were customary for "a Gentleman of good Expectations." He also demanded funds for dancing and fencing lessons. Manigault articulated how things—clothes, food, works of art—did not merely express personal identity, but could positively transform it. He asked for tokens of Carolina life, like turtles and rum. He judged Englishwomen inferior to Carolinians. And—again and again—he swore that "nothing will please me more than to return to my native country" whenever the time was right. Before 1754, when he was called home, that time was

always an indeterminate point in the future. Like so many of his fellow colonials, Manigault wished to be considered an English gentleman. And what better place to become one, and to live like one, than England? Things made the man. "I am become," he declared with pride, "a perfect Englishman."[94]

Travelers were just one group of colonials who participated in the debate over America's relationship to Britain as the imperial crisis escalated. Nevertheless, they spoke with heightened authority because of their exposure to the Old World. Robert Patterson recalled of John Ewing, who had traveled to Britain in the mid-1770s, "He had collected much information and many anecdotes, which on his return were reserved for the amusement and instruction of that social circle, which he loved to collect at his own fireside." Similarly, Elizabeth Graeme's trip abroad boosted her already formidable reputation as a hostess and poet. Known by some as "Lady Ferguson" after her return because she had been presented to the king, Graeme's popular salon benefited both from her élan and from its reputation as being "modeled after the English fashion." Travelers' consciousness of Britain's beauties and flaws was particularly intense. No wonder, then, that the American Revolution strained, but could not break, Americans' ties with Britain. The Treaty of Paris settled the political terms of the new nation's relations with its former colonial master, but cultural relations were another matter. The powerful bonds created by a long colonial history and intensified by frequent travel in the decades preceding independence created tensions that would strain America's identity vis-à-vis the Old World well into the next century.[95]

"The blows my republican principles receive are forcible"

1783–1820

Having achieved independence, Americans had to redefine their relationship to Europe, and especially to Great Britain. Many people were uneasy about a connection of any sort. The young republic's geopolitical situation was tenuous. An enormous but sparsely settled territory, the United States confronted a number of dilemmas: rivals to the north, west, south, and on the seas; Native American nations within its borders; a weak government and a weaker sense of national cohesion; and skepticism, if not outright hostility, toward their republican experiment among the kingdoms of Europe. It seemed as if establishing some distance from the Old World might be a prudent course. That proved to be impracticable, however. The challenges of 1783, trying as they were, soon got far worse. Most Americans had greeted news of the French Revolution with hope. The principles of self-government had penetrated despotic Europe. But as the Revolution devolved into Terror, war, and empire, public opinion grew angry and divided. The United States found it impossible to remain neutral in a world of clashing empires. Like no time in American history before or since, Europe intruded itself into domestic affairs regardless of what Americans may have wanted.[1]

Cultural controversies also rendered Americans unable to distance themselves from Europe. The United States was a nation that lacked a strong national identity.[2] As we have seen, colonial Americans tried desperately to show that, living on the far side of the Atlantic, they were nevertheless fully British. Although postrevolutionary Americans agreed that their political relationship with Great Britain was finished with, the terms of their cultural independence were unclear. Nationalists believed that independence would be incomplete without some degree of national distinctiveness. But the extent to which the republic should sever its cultural and historical connections with Britain was hotly debated, particularly after the rise of the Jeffersonian opposition in the

1790s. Purists repudiated any cultural debt to Europe and urged Americans to fashion their own culture shorn of the Old World's influence. Massachusetts-born Elkanah Watson, sent on a diplomatic mission to France in 1779, imagined that if a wall were to divide Europe from the United States, "the one, sinking into the dotage and imbecility of decay, would be deprived of the renovating influence of its young offspring, whilst the other would be protected from the contaminating effects of the matured corruptions of the old world."[3]

Metaphors of contagion permeated Americans' discourse on their relationship with Europe in this period. Inevitably these debates addressed the appropriateness of Americans' travel to the Old World. After all, if Americans might be infected by European fashions, music, and literature while in the safety of their homes, how much more dangerous was direct exposure? Caution was in order. John Adams warned Elkanah Watson to "cultivate the manners of your own country, not those of Europe" during his time abroad. Adams did not mean for Watson and other travelers to quarantine themselves, as it were, from Europeans, but merely to follow "a manly simplicity" in their dress and behavior appropriate to republicans. For Adams, the danger was not merely that Europe might corrupt provincial Americans, but that a lack of self-consciousness might lead them to succumb to European dissipation and thereby damage "the character of their country at home and abroad." Both the new nation's virtue and its reputation were at stake as its citizens ventured overseas.[4]

Clearly, for all their brave talk of cultural independence, Americans still craved a connection to Europe and deferred to its cultural authority. Travelers led Americans to define an identity vis-à-vis Europe that staked out a distinctive nationalism while situating the republic within the Atlantic community. Travelers forced Americans to confront and accept their transnational position, as Thomas Jefferson came to know all too well. As minister to France from 1785 to 1789, he fielded inquiries from prospective travelers and extended hospitality to those visiting Paris. To the former, Jefferson stressed the disadvantages of going abroad. He told one correspondent that going to Europe cost a traveler in "his knowledge, in his morals, in his health, in his habits, and in his happiness." Americans were better advised to travel through the United States, where they could get to know their country—and each other—better. But his countrymen ignored his counsel, perhaps observing that the Paris-loving Jefferson was not inclined to heed the advice he gave to others. Confronted with Americans knocking on his door seeking counsel, letters of introduction, and hospitality, Jefferson relented and composed a memorandum to prospective American travelers to Europe.[5]

Jefferson's "Hints" admonished Americans to dedicate their travels to an intense study of Europe. The Old World had many merits whose introduction would benefit the United States, but it also had many vices that it must avoid. Jefferson urged travelers to observe both so that they would "return charged, like a bee, with the honey of wisdom, a blessing to [their] country and honour and comfort to [their] friends." The memorandum advised Americans abroad to mind European agricultural practices, technological innovations, art and architecture. Political economy deserved special attention, since government determined a people's happiness more than any other institution. Jefferson thus charged young Americans to enter "the hovels of the laborers" to assess the impact of public policies, chiefly taxation. But Jefferson also recommended attention to the rich and powerful, especially courts, whose denizens he likened to "beasts of prey." Travelers had to be careful: courts were full of snares ready to entice naïve Americans, who would become contemptuous of the republican institutions of their country. Nor could courtly manners be reconciled with "that honest simplicity, now prevailing in America." Travelers must immerse themselves in Europe, but with caution.[6]

Elkanah Watson was tantalized by the vision of a "wall of separation" dividing the United States from Europe, but at the same time he admitted that the New World was the "young offspring" of the Old. It was that recognition—and nearly all Americans of European descent saw it—that made it impossible to disengage culturally from Europe. Nevertheless, those tensions made attempts to resolve the terms of their European connection extraordinarily fruitful and divisive. Of all these issues, the Anglo-American dilemma was clearly the most sensitive. Even Anglophiles fretted about the proper relationship between the newly independent United States and its former colonial master during this anxious, sometimes hostile period. Relations with revolutionary France were also fraught with tension. And, as members of the Atlantic community, Americans also had to consider the nature of their connection with the other nations of the Continent. Catholicism complicated this task, but so did issues relating to social class, privilege, and gentility. Was it desirable—or even appropriate—for Americans to be presented at court, or to attend lavish parties and balls? Finally, Americans abroad participated in efforts to create a national identity. One way they did so was by fashioning nationality via sociability. Americans from diverse regions and states sought out each other's company in a conscious effort to create nationhood one personal relationship at a time.

Postcolonial Anxieties: The Problem of Britain

Early in 1824 the Anglo-Irish writer Maria Edgeworth wrote a letter of thanks to John Griscom. In 1818–19 Griscom, a New York educator, had spent a year traveling throughout Britain and the Continent. He published his letters in 1823 as *A Year in Europe*. Edgeworth wrote to thank Griscom for the "freedom from national jealousy"—meaning the absence of Anglophobia—in his book. Griscom's generous attitude toward England astounded Edgeworth, accustomed as she was to more than a quarter century of mutual Anglo-American sniping, much of it expressed in travel literature. It was essential, Edgeworth wrote, that this "invidious & degrading spirit cease on both sides of the Atlantic!"[7]

Though of recent origin, Anglophobia had struck deep roots in the United States. It was not unknown before 1776—Scots, Scots-Irish, and German colonials had no love for England—but it spread rapidly during and after the Revolutionary War.[8] It flared during moments of public excitement, such as the controversy over Jay's Treaty, the impressment crisis, and of course the War of 1812. Hatred toward England was never far below the surface of early national culture. One historian observes that Pennsylvania's Democrat-Republicans blamed Great Britain "for nearly everything amiss in America." Much the same could be said for Jeffersonians elsewhere.[9] Certainly Anglophobia was more prevalent than its opposite. Outright Anglophilia was limited mainly to circles of privileged Federalism in New England.[10] Affection for England was held in check by geopolitical tensions, outright war between 1812 and 1815, and, after Napoleon abandoned his dream of a New World empire, the knowledge that Britain alone represented a threat to the growth and safety of the United States. It was this understanding that led John Adams to say that "Britain will never be our Friend, till We are her Master."[11] Extreme statements of love or hatred toward England got the attention of contemporaries and historians alike, but most Americans struck a more moderate course. They feared British power but were open to cultural and commercial ties between the two countries. Beyond a core of old-line New England Federalists, most of what seems like Anglophilia in the early republic is better understood as hostility toward France. As a result, pro-British attitudes cooled as the French threat disappeared after 1815.[12] Likewise, by 1820, anti-English prejudice moderated to the point where Americans and Britons could begin to fashion the foundations for an Anglo-American rapprochement that would bear fruits in reform, diplomacy, and cultural collaboration.

These patterns are confirmed by the reflections of postrevolutionary Americans visiting the British Isles. A few Americans abroad could muster nothing

positive to say about England or the English. For James West, the differences between England and the United States were epitomized by the virtues of his native Philadelphia and the vices of London. He called attention to "the republican simplicity" of the United States and Britain's "haughty overbearing aristocracy," to the "comfort & conveniences which with us are distributed so equally among all ranks & classes, & the glare of splendour & thoughtless prodigality" in England. West dismissed London as a modern-day "Sodom & Gomorrah." Other travelers made more politically barbed denunciations of England. John Brown Cutting, a New York veteran of the Revolutionary War visiting London in 1790, told his South Carolina friend John Rutledge Jr. that his observation of the House of Commons demonstrated that "the love of lucre was . . . the ruling passion of John [Bull]." The corruption and hypocrisy of members of Parliament underscored for Cutting the genius "of our glorious constitution!" The United States could only become great, these Americans concluded, by repudiating its English antecedents.[13]

Counterbalancing these one-dimensional portrayals of perfidious Albion was an equally unsophisticated Anglophilia. Joseph Stevens Buckminster, a young Unitarian minister, found even "the least ornamented part of England" superior in refinement to the United States during his 1806 tour. It was, he judged, "the most charming country on the face of the earth." Even George Ticknor, part of a new generation of New England intellectuals who shunned their predecessors' deference for everything English, found nothing to criticize there in 1815. He assumed that the United States and Britain shared, and must continue to share, a common civilization. Ticknor expressed contempt for French manners and morals, satisfied that England and the United States would never seek to imitate its "ominous state of civilization and refinement." Though a nationalist, Ticknor assumed that England and the United States were two nations united by a shared culture and history.[14]

Predictable as the views of these second-generation New England Federalists were, they were not limited to that cohort. James Oldden, a young Philadelphia Quaker on a trip through northern Europe in 1800, conceded that all patriots would instinctively prefer their own country to all others. Still, he concluded that considering "every thing that one may suppose necessary to the enjoying of life to the greatest summit, the little spot of old England carries far away the palm." Likewise, when Francis Kinloch of South Carolina toured Europe in 1803–4, he was struck by the inferiority of nearly everything to its English counterpart. Kinloch condemned Milan because he found "nothing like those neat and comfortable farmhouses" that he had seen in England and the eastern United

States. Sociability also served Kinloch with an example of Anglo-American comity. At Agen in southwestern France, Kinloch fell in with a band of English officers, prisoners of war, "who fastened on me, as they would have done upon a countryman, nor did I feel less for them than if I had been."[15]

Most travelers to England fell between these extremes. They were aware of the Jeffersonian indictment of England. They also heard the arguments of cultural nationalists like the editors of the Baltimore literary magazine *The Portico*, who admonished Americans for being "servilely dependent" upon Europe, particularly Britain, for all of their opinions, from art to philosophy to politics.[16] But somehow most American travelers resisted succumbing to the powerful attraction of Anglophobia. They remained cautiously critical of England, and they knew that, as a practical matter of affairs between nations, the United States and Great Britain had important differences. Nevertheless, they hoped that ties of history, ethnicity, and politics that had bound the two together in the past as colony and mother country would be reestablished on a more egalitarian footing between two independent nations. When Elkanah Watson set foot in England in 1782, the conflicted emotions he felt stemmed from this tension between national interest and a common identity based on language, history, culture, and kinship. "This was the land of our rancorous foe and imperious tyrants," Watson reflected. "Still it was the land of our forefathers." During the next Anglo-American war, Mordecai Noah was captured while en route to Tunis and taken to England. As an official from a belligerent nation, he expected a hostile reception. But he was surprised to be told by the Alien Office in London that he was free to roam around the country. Noah smarted over signs that the English still resented American independence, but he anticipated that the time was near when Britain would come to see the United States as a friend and ally. Likewise, he admonished Anglophobes not to be ashamed of their English roots. England possessed "much to admire and imitate," he insisted.[17]

Anglophobia waned as memories of the Revolutionary War and War of 1812 faded. Hair-trigger denunciations of England became rare as Americans attained the emotional distance to assess Britain coolly. But their critical faculties remained sharp. After nearly a month at sea, Robert C. Johnson set foot on "the ground of Old England, so long the great object of my wishes," in November 1792. The son of a prominent Federalist family from Stratford, Connecticut, Johnson had set ambitious goals for his European tour. He hoped, but did not necessarily expect, to return from abroad "more in love with America." So he appraised England carefully. Johnson was disappointed to find the inhabitants of Bristol unhinged by the military threat of revolutionary France. The city's

women seemed hale, yet still lacking "that delicacy of features and form so common in America." London's resources for instruction and amusement seemed inexhaustible, and he marveled at the ability of the police to keep order in the teeming city. On the other hand, Johnson could not approve of how Britons lavished "immense sums" on the theater while parsimony rendered their courts of law "a shame and a disgrace to the British nation." Much to his surprise, Johnson did in fact depart England with a higher opinion of the United States. Worcester, Massachusetts's Andrew Bigelow, traveling in England after the conclusion of the War of 1812, also demonstrated the ability to be critical toward England despite his temperamental Anglophilia. After several months traveling through England and Scotland, Bigelow reassessed the glowing portrayal of England in Benjamin Silliman's popular *Journal of Travels in England, Holland, and Scotland* (1812), a book he much admired. Bigelow was forced to conclude that Silliman "looked upon objects and things [in England] with ye feelings of a boy."[18]

Many Americans who visited England traveled to Scotland as well. A little time north of the Tweed helped Americans clarify their views of England. Americans admired England's modernity and economic development, its liberalism, and its emerging middle-class culture. However, they found much to deplore, particularly its stark disparities of wealth, anti-Americanism, and aversion to republicanism. England's influence on the United States was potentially dangerous. But Scotland seemed free of these flaws and therefore a safer and more worthwhile destination—and a model for what England might one day become. When John Baylor, a Caroline County, Virginia, planter, sought advice about his sons' education in 1796, his English friend John Frere told him to avoid English schools. Even if the boys could escape being infected by vice at Oxford or Cambridge, Frere warned, the ideas "they would carry back to America would not contribute much to their future happiness or usefulness." He recommended the University of Glasgow as a better and safer school, a place where "*solid & useful* knowledge might be acquired." Even his English friends, who wished to establish the good relations that ought to "exist between two people so nearly allied in interest & birth as you Americans and we Britons," thought that England's atmosphere was too toxic for impressionable young Americans.[19]

While England seemed retrograde in many ways, Scotland struck Americans as a pleasing blend of modernity and antiquity. Travelers were particularly impressed by Edinburgh's New Town. Built north of the city's crowded medieval neighborhoods in the late eighteenth century, the New Town and its elegant streets compared favorably with crowded, dirty London. Andrew Leslie of Richmond characterized the New Town as "Regularity itself." Its streets were

broad and straight, the houses constructed of stone and in a consistently grand style. Scottish agriculture also displayed its modernity: Andrew Bigelow was surprised to find crops "as luxuriant and cultivation as high" as the best English fields. Besides urban planning, women's education in Scotland impressed Andrew Leslie. While women in the States were whisked out of school and into society before they were sufficiently educated, in Scotland girls remained in school until their minds were well cultivated. "They are *then* ushered into company, where they appear with the ease & courtesy of true ladies, but at the same time with that modesty & decorum, inseparable from well *educated* persons." Scotland exhibited a progressive air, but it was not lacking the historical and antiquarian features that Americans craved. No American visited Edinburgh without touring Holyrood Palace, the official seat of Scottish royals, to see the spot where David Rizzio, rumored lover of Queen Mary, had been murdered by nobles sympathetic to Elizabeth I. Gullible visitors convinced themselves they could still see his blood stains on the floor.[20]

Americans admired Scotland's blending of modernity and history, but above all they appreciated Scottish hospitality. Scots simply seemed to respect Americans more than the English. There were exceptions, of course: George Watson told his parents of the "envious slanders, which upon every occasion are poured out upon the *Yankies*" in Edinburgh. Watson may have been referring to English medical students, however, and not Scots. Even the Anglophile Benjamin Silliman admitted that in Scotland "there is much more kindness towards us, and some share of real knowledge" about the United States. When Americans considered how ignorant most English people were of American affairs, they could not help but be flattered by Scottish recognition. Americans found Scots to be less anti-American, less resentful of American independence, than the English. In Scotland, American travelers encountered a people who took them seriously and treated them with respect, even affection—a people who saw the United States as a peer in the Atlantic community.[21]

William C. Preston, a young Virginian, experienced Scottish-American kinship firsthand when he toured Britain with Washington Irving in 1817. An innkeeper near Loch Achray misidentified the pair as Englishmen. The pair quickly set him to rights, at which point he offered them rooms for the night gratis. Preston, recalling the "surly and ill mannered and unsympathyzing manner" of the people to the south, understood his host's aversion to the English. Worcester's Andrew Bigelow also found a hearty welcome as an American during his studies in Scotland. The poet Anne Grant, who had lived outside Albany as a child in the 1760s, was a warm friend of the United States who extended hospi-

tality to Americans visiting Edinburgh. At a party there in March 1817, Bigelow noted that the company sang "Yankee Doodle" to "*great applause*." Grant was not even the staunchest friend of the United States in Edinburgh. That honor went to David Erskine, the 11th Earl of Buchan. An eccentric antiquarian, the earl took a keen interest in the United States and sought out visiting Americans. "He has a great love for our countrymen," observed Bigelow after Buchan dropped in for tea one December afternoon. Breakfasting in the earl's library the following morning, Bigelow found himself in the "Washington Room" decorated by a bronze bust of the first president, as well as likenesses of Alexander Hamilton and Benjamin Rush, a framed letter of Thomas Jefferson, and several New York landscapes. On Washington's Birthday, Buchan invited all the resident Americans to breakfast, at which he delivered a rambling address praising the United States. Though the New Englander found Buchan's American mania puzzling, he appreciated his efforts to "correct and neutralize" Bigelow's temperamental Anglophilia. The earl's efforts were certainly extreme, but Americans were enormously heartened by Scottish hospitality. It provided them with the respect they craved, and it signified that, after the disappointments of the French Revolution, they had a potential partner in the cause of Atlantic republicanism.[22]

Over time, Americans came to see England as a potential partner as well. Anti-Americanism declined there as memories of the Revolution grew dim. Travelers increasingly encountered less outright hostility and more ignorance, which—while annoying—was nevertheless an improvement. Asked by a nobleman whether Americans spoke English as fluently as he, Benjamin Silliman noted that "similar queries and expressions of surprise on this subject, are common in England, where, after all that has passed, most people are surprisingly ignorant of the real situation of America." Sociability also softened American Anglophobia, since few travelers had access to the upper reaches of British society where anti-Americanism was deepest. Instead, their connections brought them into the company of the middle class and lesser gentry, who tended to be sympathetic to the United States. John and Benjamin Vaughan, English émigrés living in Philadelphia and Boston, respectively, wrote letters of introduction to their brother William for George Ticknor when he sailed to England in 1815. Ticknor dined with William soon after his landing and found him as friendly toward the United States as his brothers. Benjamin Rush's many connections smoothed his son James's 1810 tour through England. The young man received so much hospitality that he far overspent the time he had allotted for his tour. His fellow Pennsylvanian Thomas Lee Shippen was hardly uncritical of England when he arrived in 1787—"The sun of this country seems to me

near setting," he smugly told his grandfather—but the hospitality he received helped change his mind. By the time he sailed home in the spring of 1789, he had come to esteem England second only to the United States.[23]

Much as it had in colonial times, this sense of Anglo-American kinship developed even further when Britons and Americans encountered each other on the Continent. Differences between them, which seemed so glaring in Britain, suddenly seemed insignificant. Certainly this was the case with locals, who found it impossible to distinguish Britons from Americans. Mordecai Noah gleefully witnessed "broad, honest, roast-beef countenance[d]" Englishmen sporting American golden eagle pins on their hats in order to pass as Americans in 1814 Paris. Moreover, if only because they lacked their own texts, Americans used English-authored guidebooks on their continental travels. Jefferson read John Eustace's *Classical Tour through Italy* (1816) and owned a wide variety of English guidebooks, which he recommended to prospective travelers. William Short carried many of Jefferson's books when he took his own Grand Tour in 1788. Robert C. Johnson depended on Thomas Nugent's *The Grand Tour* (1749) and Lawrence Sterne's bawdy *Sentimental Journey through France and Italy* (1768) during his travels. These books did not limit themselves to practical information. They assumed the superiority of Britain to the nations of the Continent. Eustace's *Classical Tour,* published during the long struggle with revolutionary France, noted that England's constitution "comprises the excellencies of all the ancient commonwealths, together with the advantages of the best forms of monarchy." Americans surely took such pronouncements with a large grain of salt, but it was not only the common language that made these books attractive. The foundations of British nationalism that they extolled—Protestantism, commerce, liberty—were not so far from those championed by Americans.[24]

This brings us back to John Griscom, Maria Edgeworth, and improving Anglo-American relations. Why did the absence of Anglophobia in Griscom's book come as such a surprise to Edgeworth? Simply put, the published sources Edgeworth read gave her a distorted sense of American hostility toward England. Private opinion—including that of travelers—was far more temperate. Edgeworth acknowledged that this was true of sentiments on her side of the Atlantic. British writers caricatured the United States, but things were changing in private society, she claimed: "It is now becoming *fashionable* indeed in London to *speak* well of Americans." She hoped that Griscom's book was evidence that such a thaw was beginning in the States, but she had her doubts. Edgeworth's fears probably stemmed from the so-called Paper War, the exchange of nationalist insults traded by the literati of England and the United

States beginning in 1814. Lingering ill feelings, transportation and publishing lags, and domestic political utility conspired to keep this cultural cold war alive well into the 1820s. Referring as she did specifically to a travel account, Edgeworth may well have been referencing the most hostile of American writings on English society and culture, James Kirke Paulding's *A Sketch of Old England*, published in 1822.[25] Paulding told Americans that England was irrelevant to the future development of the United States. He accused American travel writers of being taken in by the hype of British superiority, of assuming that "every thing here, animate and inanimate, moral, political, and intellectual" must be superior to its American counterpart. Paulding set out to show Americans that "all Englishmen are neither Shakespeares and Miltons in poetry, nor Lockes and Bacons in philosophy, nor Newtons in science." In fact, Paulding engaged in the same wholesale dismissal of English society that he accused British writers of committing against the United States. The indictment was so extreme that in old age Paulding, despite his lifelong Anglophobia, expressed regret for *A Sketch of Old England*'s relentlessly bitter, angry tone.[26]

Edgeworth feared that Paulding's Anglophobia was representative of American opinion. As we have seen, it was not. Most American travelers were nationalists who harbored grave misgivings about Britain, but they were not ideologues seeking to develop a distinctive American identity by smearing all things English. Edgeworth warned that when any "nation or one world begins to deprecate the other, indulgence & sympathy ceases."[27] In his *Year in Europe*, Griscom had echoed these sentiments. While riding in a carriage from London to Derby early in 1819, one of Griscom's passengers commenced a tirade against American manners and morals. Griscom learned that this otherwise pleasant gentleman's indictment was based solely on a two-month stay in eastern New York, during which he had hardly any social contacts. Griscom concluded that, because Britons visited the United States with "inflated expectations of wealth, independence, and purity of morals" and seldom had any entrée into polite society—thus seeing everything from the outside—it was not surprising that they not only became disenchanted but returned home to "write and publish observations replete with unfairness, if not with the grossest calumnies."

Griscom decided to use the confrontation to make an appeal for Anglo-American rapprochement. "It is time for every honest man," Griscom declared, "in both countries, to set his face against every thing that tends to oppose the temper of mutual forebearance, and that unison of feeling, toward which, the common origin, the common language and literature, the common sense, and the common welfare of the two nations, have so direct and natural a tendency."[28]

Edgeworth and Griscom joined in calling for an end to the self-indulgence of anti-Americanism and Anglophobia so that Britons and Americans could get on with the business of promoting that spirit of improvement that respectable people identified as the peculiar mission of English-speaking people on both sides of the Atlantic.[29]

Griscom's vision of Anglo-American unity flourished on both sides of the Atlantic as tensions between Britain and the United States eased after 1815. Americans did not naïvely come to see the British lion as benign. They knew that Great Britain alone had the wherewithal to challenge the expansion of American power. Moreover, Anglophobia would remain a powerful force in American cultural life well into the nineteenth century. It became central to the identity of the Democratic Party, although even Jacksonians took a less ideological approach toward Britain as diplomats settled disputes over Maine, the Canada–United States boundary, and Oregon.[30] With the War of 1812 honorably settled and memories of the Revolutionary War receding into dim memory, the postrevolutionary generations were busy fashioning their own definition of nationhood.[31] To most Americans, Anglophobia was not crucial to this project. Britain simply did not appear to be the existential threat she had been in 1780 and 1812. With their feet on the ground of the Old World, travelers pioneered this more sophisticated assessment of Anglo-American relations. For Andrew Bigelow, making land in Whitehaven after an excursion to Ireland, the words of William Cowper said it best: " 'England with all thy faults, I love thee still': *Thee,* in whom I find much that *I love* and more that I *admire.*"[32]

Jacobins, Beggars, and Papists: The Continent

Americans' encounters with Great Britain were complicated by a long colonial past and a more recent history of resentment and hostility. Working out a relationship with the nations of the Continent proved to be even more complex. Their English roots inclined many Americans to view Europe as an unattractive "other": poor, oppressed, backward, Catholic. Yet even Britons had related to continentals as fellow Europeans. The Grand Tour allowed young, privileged Englishmen to engage with their continental peers and to connect with Europe's art and history. As heirs to that tradition, American travelers engaged non-Anglophone Europe on similar terms. Postrevolutionary Americans certainly reveled in their newness. They flattered themselves that the United States represented a break from a bleak history of war, superstition, religious conflict, and other Old World evils. Yet Americans did not repudiate their European past.

Nationalist rhetoric aside, separating from Europe was simply unthinkable. But how would the newly independent United States—republican, Protestant, the most prosperous society in the Atlantic World—define its relationship to continental Europe? In order to answer that question, Americans had to resolve their complicated feelings toward France, reach an understanding about the roots of European poverty, confront their anti-Catholicism, and struggle with the tension between aristocracy and republicanism.

France presented Americans with their toughest dilemma. After 1783, some Americans believed that France would replace Britain as the United States' closest European friend and major trading partner. Realizing this new relationship would require Americans to shed deeply held prejudices against France, however. At a 1782 party celebrating the birth of the Dauphin, patriot physician Benjamin Rush remarked that the affair represented a "revolution" in the American mind. How else could Philadelphians rejoice in the good fortune of an "ancient" enemy whose religion was "unfriendly to humanity" and whose state epitomized "monarchy and slavery"? Rush could only conclude that "there are no prejudices so strong . . . that will not yield to the love of liberty."[33] Elkanah Watson had not shed his Massachusetts prejudices when he visited France late in the American Revolution. The ever-present beggars shocked him, and he was scandalized by the licentiousness of the theater. Over time, however, Watson came to believe that France had much to teach the United States. Relations with France, Watson conjectured, might allow the United States to "shake off the leading-strings of Britain." Independence presented Americans with a unique opportunity: to fashion a national character deliberately, from the ground up. Watson recommended that Americans combine the best of their British traits with "French ease and elegance" to create "a happy compound of national character and manners, yet to be modeled."[34]

Americans never shed the anti-French prejudices they had inherited from England. But the early republic was the period in which Americans developed a counterimage of France, a more positive sense of the country as the vanguard of European republicanism—and, thus, the heir to and partner of the United States. The reevaluation of France began during the American Revolution with the alliance that helped the United States win its independence. Americans felt intensely grateful for that aid, and they idolized its personification, the Marquis de Lafayette. But, despite Elkanah Watson's hopes, republican America and France under the Old Regime were too different for old prejudices to fall away. In any case Americans' impressions of France were more influenced by the 1789 Revolution than the Ancien Régime. The Revolution failed to establish a

republic in France, and its twisted, violent course produced intense divisions in the United States. Nevertheless, Americans never gave up on French liberalism. In a manner both patronizing and fraternal, nineteenth-century Americans looked to France as the nation most likely to join the United States in spreading republican principles. A Philadelphia orator predicted that "France has not only profited by our example, but the Old World bids fair to be regenerated by the New." Travelers saw France as Catholic, morally corrupt, poor, and despotic. But that just made France typically European in American eyes. In one essential respect, France was different: above all other European nations, Americans believed it to be the best hope for republicanism.[35]

Americans initially united in support for the French Revolution. With little understanding of its peculiarly French roots, they assumed the essential sameness of American and French republicanism. While distressed by news of the violent demonstrations that led to the fall of the Bastille, Thomas Lee Shippen did not doubt that the unrest represented "the last effort of dying Despotism and that the struggle will now be closed for ever." The triumph was inevitable, given that republicanism in France and the United States was nothing less than "the cause of human nature."[36] Some Americans even argued that republican France could provide a model for what a new cosmopolitan nationalism might look like—fraternal, transnational, and Anglophobic. This nationalist vision survived among Jeffersonians once the Terror began in 1792, although it did not completely die out among Americans generally. Ralph Izard Jr., a naval officer from an arch-Federalist South Carolina family, was ordered to enter the Brittany town of Lorient to procure supplies in November 1795. In this "land of liberty and equality," he told his parents, a baker refused payment for bread from his brethren across the sea, "Bon Americains, & Bon republicains." Being abroad, young Izard and his shipmates may have been isolated from the polarization of American political society into pro-English and pro-French camps. It was still possible for him to envision France and the United States bound together in the cause of spreading liberty across the Atlantic World.[37]

Other travelers who witnessed the progress of the Revolution firsthand had grave doubts about similarities between the United States and France. These more critical voices appealed to older, British conceptions of France that resonated among the largely Federalist cohort of leisure travelers. Terror, war, and the consolidation of power by Napoleon Bonaparte reinvigorated these caricatures of French national character. As early as 1790, John Brown Cutting told John Rutledge Jr. that the National Assembly's abolition of the nobility and its replacement of the provinces by Departments had turned him against the Revolu-

tion. Cutting insisted he was no Burkean and claimed to "love the French, very much, [and] wish to see them prosperous & happy." Yet he argued that the American and French Revolutions had very little in common. Americans "acknowledged that part of what we possessed was worthy to be retained," whereas the French "made an indiscriminate destruction of every thing whether good or evil." Cutting's portrayal of the French as hasty, passionate, and unreflective put them at odds with American—and British—stability and common sense. Another traveler, Philadelphian John Godfrey, felt uneasy about French efforts to forge a common identity between their cause and that of the United States. At a play in the French-occupied Netherlands in 1795, Godfrey approved of the United States and France represented as sister republics joined "with the utmost conviviality." He was less pleased at another performance featuring an ethereal "Liberty" entrapping "aristocracy" in her winds and substituting "Republicanism" in its stead. Godfrey was more impressed by the poverty he saw in French-controlled Europe. The money spent on the plays, Godfrey believed, typified French prodigality. It would have been better spent on lands in America on which "their almost starving poor" could be resettled.[38]

Napoleon Bonaparte's rise and fall only complicated efforts to assess the potential for Franco-American comity. On the one hand, Napoleon's despotic government and militarism clearly set France against values Americans saw as core principles, even at this formative stage of national identity. Some Americans went so far as to convince themselves that Napoleon was the Antichrist. To others he was merely a "republican apostate." Yet still others were dazzled by Napoleon's charisma, his amazing military successes, and his popularity among the French. It was possible that Bonaparte represented not the betrayal of French republicanism but its fruition. One admiring biographer admitted that Napoleon committed acts that "as freemen we must condemn." Yet his overweening ambition also led him to imagine and execute great things to improve the lives of those he ruled.[39] James West, a Pennsylvanian visiting Paris in 1810, epitomized this uncertainty. In late January, he acquired tickets to attend mass with the emperor in his private chapel and stood only ten feet away during the service. He was, he candidly told his father, simply awestruck. "The moment he entered I lost sight of every other object," said West. He wrote that Napoleon's face broadcast great intelligence and wisdom, full of "a conscious superiority which seemed to say '*I yield not to Mortal Man.*'" Later, West admitted to seeking out Napoleon repeatedly and even claimed to have shadowed him on an inspection tour of the Louvre. Even so, West maintained he had "no affection" for Napoleon. During the emperor's exile on Elba, West expressed embarrassment

when he discovered that his letters lauding Napoleon and predicting disaster for Britain had been printed in several American newspapers. His enthusiasm for imperial France having run its course, James West turned his back on "selfish and unprincipled" Europe and looked forward to "peaceful obscurity" back in the United States.[40]

France after the Restoration remained a subject of fascination. It was still the essential destination for those women and men interested in European art, music, and fashion. Americans also remained vitally interested in French politics, although sympathy for France never again became so nearly universal as it was in the early years of the Revolution. France became the favorite example both for those who predicted the eventual worldwide triumph of free government and for those who doubted whether it had a future in the Old World. Most early nineteenth-century Americans were in the former camp, a position typified by the Virginia traveler John Tucker Bowdoin. In most respects he found France inferior to Britain. Its horticulture was unimpressive, and Bowdoin missed the "beautifully diversified" landscape of the British countryside, with its hedges, cottages, and copses of trees. Moreover, Bowdoin was shocked that the French, who were civilized in such a high degree in so many ways, were "so bestial in others." Something happened to Bowdoin in Cambrai (about 145 kilometers southeast of Calais) that provoked him to write that "one cannot walk the streets without having more than one sense intolerably offended." If Bowdoin's experiences in some respects reinforced old English prejudices, he still retained a quintessentially American faith in French republicanism. That faith was rewarded when some Frenchmen told him that they had no respect for Louis XVIII and looked forward to the reestablishment of the republic. Bowdoin was even more impressed by their candor considering that he understood that the French police relentlessly repressed dissent. Not surprisingly, then, Bowdoin took great satisfaction when the king rode by and "not a solitary 'vive le roi' was heard from the crowd in the streets!"[41]

France in 1820 presented Americans with a puzzle. They wondered if it would ever join them among the ranks of republican nations. Its manners, and especially its morals, struck them as alien, if not repugnant. Americans objected to what they perceived as French immorality, particularly regarding sexuality and marital relations. In the 1830s and afterward, travelers would focus on those issues as they assessed America's relationship with France. At this time, however, they focused on matters of politics and government. For all its cultural differences with the United States, France remained the best hope for European republicanism. That conviction allowed Americans to feel a kinship with France

they had for no other European nation. Paris was still the primary destination for travelers interested in culture, pleasure, and refinement. If Americans had trouble making sense of France, it was because its complexity pulled them in many directions simultaneously.[42]

The scale of poverty they encountered on the Continent challenged Americans' efforts to see themselves as part of the European world. Of course, Americans knew poverty at home. Southerners saw it among their slaves, and many white families in the region owned little or no property. Likewise, deprivation was becoming endemic in the rapidly growing cities of the North.[43] But continental poverty seemed of a different sort altogether. The sheer number of the poor, their dire condition, and the absence of social mobility seemed to distinguish Europe sharply from both the United States and, to a lesser extent, England. Moreover, in Europe Americans saw poverty juxtaposed with signs of lavish wealth and entrenched privilege, which heightened their sense of injustice.

In writing about poverty, travelers during this period developed three themes that would become more fully elaborated in subsequent decades. First, we can see in travelers' reflections on European social conditions the roots of what became, in the 1830s, a core element of American national identity: the "egalitarian myth." Jacksonian Americans bragged that their society was distinguished by a near equality of condition between the rich and the poor. Success was available to everyone, depending on merit, and nobody remained rich or poor for very long.[44] Second, Americans did not merely take note of poverty: they struggled to explain it, and they thought about how to fix it. Their primary explanation for poverty—bad government—linked America's fate with Europe's. Self-government would end the cycle of misgovernment and hopelessness that sustained poverty, they believed. Finally, because continental poverty seemed far worse than the English variety, the experience of it tended to push Americans to identify more closely with England. Americans did not always ascribe poverty to bad government. Sometimes they thought it was caused by moral turpitude, retrograde attitudes toward women and the family, or Catholicism. These explanations underscored the cultural distance between Americans and continental Europeans but made England seem more familiar.

At their least analytical, Americans remarked on the misery of the European poor and its relative absence in the United States. Thomas Russell-Greaves, a Bostonian touring France in the year before the Revolution, came upon "herds of beggars" in both the countryside and cities, "many of them without a second shirt and some with none." Emphasizing their common nationality, he told Thomas Jefferson, "indeed it is a sight we are not used to in America and to me

a most melancholy spectacle." Beggars—men, women, and children whom to all appearances had neither occupation nor residence—seemed especially prevalent in France and Italy. The ordinary working people of the Continent also appeared to subsist on a material level far below the American standard. Francis Kinloch, making an observation that would become commonplace among proslavery ideologues, thought that laborers in northern Italy "make a more miserable appearance than our negroes." They were poorly clothed, sickly, and malnourished. Americans were not only appalled by the desperate plight of the European poor, however. They also remarked on the servility that so clearly distinguished Europeans from ordinary Americans. In England, Elkanah Watson observed that "the English servant is generally an ignorant and servile being, who has no aspiration beyond his present dependent condition." Watson explained that easy social mobility made American servants unwilling to debase themselves. That made them bad servants, Watson admitted, but the tradeoff was worth it, since egalitarianism allowed all Americans to feel "self-respect as a man." While these accounts underestimated the travails of the American poor, they did accurately represent the relative affluence of ordinary people in the United States compared to Europeans. Additionally, while these travelers foreshadowed the development of the "egalitarian myth" later in the century, their accounts lacked the spread-eagled patriotism that would characterize American accounts of the European poor during the Jacksonian era.[45]

Travelers experienced continental poverty as an assault on multiple senses, which helps account for why so many of them remarked on it. They saw beggars, of course, but they also heard their cries for aid, felt their rough hands as they reached for alms, remarked on their foul odor, and even—as Francis Kinloch did—speculated on their diet. Little wonder then that Americans were not content merely to observe poverty; they felt compelled to explain it. Most travelers ascribed the misery of the European poor to oppressive government. "The transition from ease and opulence to extreme poverty" invariably struck a traveler crossing into Prussia from the Netherlands, noted Thomas Jefferson. Why the difference, given the identical soil and climate? "The governments alone differ," Jefferson answered. Soon after, Jefferson passed from Frankfurt into Hanau, a town in the Landgrave of Hesse-Kassel. The former had energy borne of commerce and freedom. Hanau impressed Jefferson with its "silence and quiet of the mansions of the dead." Such was the effect of an oppressive dynasty that ran a militarized state. Jefferson noted that in Hanau "the drum and fife is all that is heard."[46]

Misgovernment was the obvious explanation for European poverty, given the continent's natural bounty. In 1788, Thomas Shippen dismissed Chambéry (about eighty-eight kilometers south of Geneva) as "a dirty hole of a town" full of "poor half-starved ignorant devils." It made no difference that nature had bestowed on Savoy "her choicest gifts with the most profuse hand." The corruption of human institutions distorted the egalitarian tendencies of the natural world. Wherever despotic government and the Catholic religion prevailed, Shippen concluded, "wretchedness & want must ever reign along with it." In 1811, James West remarked similarly on the power of government to defeat the tendency of the environment. Nature intended France to be among the richest countries on earth, he told his father. "Man or rather *despotic government* has been constantly engaged in counteracting her intentions." Freedom was the essential precondition for prosperity, Joel Roberts Poinsett argued during his travels through Sicily in 1803. Everywhere he went on the island he saw "starved half naked figures scarcely human contending for the offal, from the rich man's table and struggling and fighting like dogs upon a dung heap for cabbage stalks to appease their nagging hunger." Self-government allowed individuals to exploit their individual talents to the maximum for the betterment of self and society. Moreover, as Poinsett suggested, Americans believed that political freedom would prevent the vast discrepancies of wealth that plagued Sicily and much of the Continent.[47]

The South Carolinian's assessment of Sicilian poverty had important implications for Americans' orientation to continental Europe. Because underdevelopment and misery were the products of despotism, they were not inevitable. The American example of resistance to oppression and the establishment of constitutional government would be the redemption of the Old World. Poinsett argued that even benign despotism bred oppression and misgovernment, leading "inevitably to violence and revolution." Even a well-meaning tyrant (Poinsett probably was referring to Napoleon) could not provide for his people as well as they could for themselves. Once Sicily had been "the granary of Rome"; now it shared the fate of Poland and Ireland, lands where outside occupation turned plenty into penury. In 1820, George Bancroft made a similar observation while traveling through Bohemia, then part of the Habsburg Empire. He found the people there to be a "different race of men from the Germans." By "race" Bancroft meant not a set of immutable biological traits (that sense of the term would emerge later) but a set of characteristics such as appearance, language, and culture that set one people apart from another. So even while Bancroft reported

that the women were ugly, the men stupid, and the children wandering around in a malnourished daze, Bohemians were every bit as deserving of opportunity as other Europeans. "They still have sense enough to know that this is oppression," Bancroft concluded, and that knowledge would in time provide for their deliverance. As an American, a beneficiary of revolution, Bancroft felt a powerful connection to oppressed people.[48]

Not all travelers ascribed European poverty to misgovernment. Some Americans thought that it was caused by flaws in national character, moral deficiencies, or mistaken notions toward women and the family. Because these causes seemed more intractable, more deeply rooted, than government, they tended to accentuate the differences between the United States and continental Europe. A few travelers came close to characterizing European peoples as racially distinct from Anglo-Americans. Ethnology and other forms of scientific racism were in their embryonic stages, so these descriptions lacked the exactness that travelers in the 1840s and 1850s would employ. Francis Kinloch observed that as soon as he passed from Switzerland into Italy, he began to observe changes in the population's character. The Swiss were hardworking and honest, but the Italians seemed sneaky and averse to labor. Like the racial theorists of the late Jacksonian period, he linked appearance and character. The countenance of the Piedmontese made them look as if they would be inclined to join "a troop of banditti" rather than engage in honest work. Kinloch did not go so far as to suggest that these traits could not be improved by changes in government, religion, or other environmental influences, but other writers did. An essay in the *Port Folio* maintained that although the ancient inhabitants of Gaul were from diverse branches of the human family, the modern French had "amalgamated into a mass possessing a national character." At their core the French exhibited "an exuberance of animal spirits," rendering them feckless, incapable of sustained action, and prone to violence. This character was beyond the influence of government or culture to alter. As a result, the writer concluded that "THE FRENCH ARE INCAPABLE OF THE BLESSINGS OF A FREE CONSTITUTION."[49]

Race-based views of national character would become popular in the 1840s and 1850s (although not among travelers), but early in the century informed people assumed that national character was flexible, shaped as it was by climate, government, religion, and other environmental influences. Nevertheless, many Americans were skeptical about the prospects for self-government on the Continent. These critics appealed to cultural differences that, they argued, fundamentally divided the United States from continental Europe. The status of women was the favorite example cited by travelers stressing difference. Joseph

Stevens Buckminster and George Ticknor, both products of respectable Massachusetts Federalism, believed that French beauty culture badly distorted women's nature. Buckminster was astonished at the youthful countenances of middle-aged French women but ascribed it to "the perfection to which they have brought the cosmetic art." He hoped that his sisters would maintain their youthful good looks without cosmetics by relying on "good sense, benevolence ever active, and piety ever grateful and ever resigned." John Godfrey diagnosed the opposite malady in Amsterdam. Women there did not objectify themselves with cosmetics, as in France. Rather, they were debased by a brutal work regimen. Even the middling women of Amsterdam, said Godfrey, were "alike destitute of Beauty & sentiment, only fit for beasts of burthen." In both cases, these travelers faulted continental societies for misunderstanding women's true calling. While primarily private and domestic beings, American women had important public responsibilities, the most important of which was maintaining the moral health of the republic. Toward the end of this period, this conception began to evolve to emphasize women's domestic autonomy and the consequent moral authority—crossing over into the public sphere—that accompanied it.[50]

That understanding of the role of women developed in tandem with the emergence of a middle-class culture in Britain and the United States. This middling culture distinguished the progressive United States and England from the backward Continent. This was the gist of Philadelphian Joseph Sansom's indictment of Rome's upper classes, which he singled out for their dissipation. He noted that Italy lacked a social class comparable with the English gentry, which, not being averse to science, education, or commerce, "embraces almost exclusively the useful and the agreeable of Life." As Sansom suggested, some Americans were comfortable with the idea of a gentry class, so long as it repudiated aristocratic values in favor of bourgeois ones such as intellectual achievement, public service, and companionate marriage. The Continent's retrograde practices did not mean that it was irredeemable, however. Travelers argued that the adoption of middle-class domesticity, as defined in England and America, might be Europe's political and moral salvation. In Italy Theodore Lyman found a culture steeped in superstition, sexual immorality, and ignorance. But it also possessed the seeds of its redemption, both native and foreign. In Milan, Lyman was heartened by a vigorous liberal movement. He also found thriving colonies of English expatriates, whom Lyman hoped would inspire "the ill-starred Italians" with "the example of English domestic life" so that fewer young women would be consigned to convents and older women would no longer take lovers. The result would be the political regeneration of the unfree parts of Europe, since

"the domestic habits of the American and English people" were as essential to the maintenance of free government as the Bill of Rights, the Magna Charta, or any political institution. Deep cultural differences separated the United States and continental Europe, but that gulf was not insurmountable. The light of Anglo-American liberalism could illuminate for Europe the path of progress.[51]

Travelers also found themselves divided by the other major feature of continental Europe they had not encountered in England: Roman Catholicism. As Christians, Americans were connected to the church. It was part of their history. Yet, as Protestants, Americans rejected Rome's authority and teachings. Postrevolutionary Americans were not nearly as anti-Catholic as they had been in colonial times or as they would become during the 1840s and 1850s, when massive Irish Catholic immigration gave rise to nativist hysteria. Nevertheless, most Americans continued to see the Catholic Church as a relic of a bygone, superstitious age, and a force for reaction in the present. Travelers distinguished between Catholic art and architecture, which they accepted as part of their European cultural heritage, and Catholic ritual and practice, which kept the Continent poor, ignorant, and unfree. Americans responded to sacred art, statuary, architecture, and even ritual with what the art historian John Davis has called "Catholic Envy." The material and religious culture of American Protestantism seemed sterile and feeble—even inadequate—in comparison with that of Catholic Europe. Travelers' awe stemmed partly from the total absence of grand architecture and classic works of sacred art in the United States. In that respect, travelers' response to the material culture of Catholicism resembled their reaction to castles, ruins, and great cities like London and Paris. But Catholic envy also had a normative dimension. It forced travelers, often in spite of themselves, to assess their own religious traditions. Some women and men found themselves considering the unthinkable: that as an expression of piety and as a means for glorifying God, Catholic ritual surpassed American Protestantism.[52]

Visiting York Cathedral late in 1816, Andrew Bigelow was delighted to have his "expectations of its magnificence and grandeur abundantly answered." Bigelow's sentiments epitomize Americans' responses to European church architecture. Much like London and Paris, the United States simply had nothing to match the splendor of Europe's cathedrals and great churches. In the 1840s some Protestants, conceding that a link existed between Catholic art and piety, adapted crucifixes, stained-glass windows, and other Catholic decorative arts to adorn Protestant churches.[53] Postrevolutionary Americans did not. After visiting St. Peter's Basilica, Joseph Sansom conceded that even the most doctrinaire

Calvinist could not help being deeply moved by a temple dedicated to the worship of the Christian God "more glorious than that of Solomon." As art and history, St. Peter's overwhelmed Sansom. As a place of piety, it left him unmoved. "*The heart of man is the Temple of the Lord*," he reminded himself, not magnificent churches. Like Sansom, travelers tried to distinguish between art and doctrine. When they could do so, Catholic painting, statuary, and architecture simply awed Americans. "I have seen nothing in Europe more calculated to impress the mind with awe," Francis Kinloch said of the magnificent Benedictine abbey of St. Michael in Piedmont. Likewise, the young Unitarian minister Joseph Stevens Buckminster discovered that words sufficient to describe Strasbourg Cathedral were "wholly out of the reach of my pen." Buckminster even conceded that this awe-inspiring church was "sacred to the piety, almost an honor to the superstition, which erected it."[54]

As Buckminster's emotional account shows, Americans saw Catholic devotional art and sacred buildings as part of their cultural inheritance. However, his struggle also demonstrates that Americans had trouble separating Catholic style from substance. St. Michael's had no sooner entranced Francis Kinloch than the Fête Dieu in Milan snapped him out of it. "Such pomp of exteriour worship, such paganism, and so little devotion," Kinloch wrote, reminded him of the essential emptiness of Catholic piety. Some of these critiques anticipated the substance and tone of antebellum nativism. John Tucker Bowdoin saw nothing to admire in the magnificence of French church architecture. He argued that a benevolent God would prefer that scarce resources be directed to relieving distress, not lavished on grand buildings. That would also be a more genuine expression of Christian piety. Observing mass or other services convinced several travelers that these rituals brainwashed believers into supporting an indolent clergy. John Godfrey thought that priests celebrated mass less from conviction than from self-interest. Its rituals mystified worshippers, making them willing to support priests in their "idleness" instead of forcing them to do productive labor.[55]

The account that came closest to anticipating antebellum nativism was penned by Virginian William C. Preston. A thoroughgoing republican, Preston had a burning hatred for aristocracy and despotism of all kinds, secular or sacred. While in Rome during his 1817–19 tour, Preston's "Protestant eye" homed in on the rituals of deference to the Catholic hierarchy and to saintly relics, both of which struck him as servile and un-American. People dutifully removed their hats to cardinals and bishops and made way for them on the streets. Believers prostrated themselves before common household objects the church marketed

as saints' relics, such as "the pocket handkerchief of Saint Veronica." The stalwart republican felt mixed emotions—anger and sorrow, mostly—at these degrading practices. "I saw the slime of the serpent everywhere," Preston concluded, "and the foul influences of his venom." Preston's indictment was well ahead of its time. It foreshadowed the avid anti-Catholicism exhibited by pious New England travelers in the 1840s and 1850s. Most travelers in Preston's cohort found the church to be strange, even offensive—but seldom dangerous.[56]

The otherness of the Roman Catholic Church was in some respects incontrovertible. At a morning mass in the Italian Alps in 1801, Joseph Sansom was shocked by a common sight in Catholic areas of Europe—an ossuary or charnel house, where human skeletal remains were kept after being disinterred several years after initial burial. Sansom gave no thought to the possibility that the local population might have good reasons for such a practice (the rocky soils of the Alps made ground for burial scarce). It was enough that he was sure that it was wrong, and that Catholic superstition was to blame. "Gaping skulls are indecently exposed to view," Sansom explained, in order to inspire "commiseration for the Souls in purgatory." As we have seen, Catholicism was not the only feature of continental Europe that American travelers struggled to connect themselves with. But to a remarkable degree travelers succeeded in demonstrating to themselves, and to their correspondents back home, that the United States was bound to continental Europe, and not only by distant historical connections. Visitors did not believe that the cultural chasm between Catholic areas of Europe and the United States was unbridgeable. Americans were certain that Catholic Europeans would overthrow the despotism of the church to become good republicans and even, the most optimistic travelers hoped, good Protestants.[57]

The relationship went both ways: travelers also insisted that Americans could learn much from continental practices. Just after his encounter with indolent priests in Antwerp, John W. Godfrey visited Ghent, where he climbed a church steeple to survey the surrounding country. It was the finest landscape he had ever seen, a model for efficient agricultural development. The land was "beautifully interspersed with small copses of woods, fields, meadows, & gardens." This was no mere pleasure excursion: Godfrey believed that Flemish skill in exploiting the productive capacity of the land around the city would provide "a usefull lesson to our American farmers." Godfrey's emphasis on what Americans had to learn from Europe is telling. His observations on the Catholic Church gave him an opportunity to emphasize the otherness of the Continent, but he chose not to take it. In an era when Americans were calibrating their

national identity on a scale from exceptionalism to cosmopolitism, Godfrey opted emphatically for the latter.[58]

The Dilemma of Aristocracy

If Americans were not unduly alarmed by Roman Catholicism, it may have been because other aspects of European culture seemed even more dangerous. Chief among these were aristocratic culture and its accoutrements, including extreme wealth, luxury, moral corruption, and gentility. Postrevolutionary Americans were deeply conflicted about genteel culture. They admired its emphasis on improvement, beautification, and education. But they also feared that gentility could rot their republican society from within. Self-government required ordinary men to maintain the personal integrity necessary to act for the good of the community. Excessive wealth led to indulgence, dependence on the rich and powerful, and inevitably to loss of freedom. Europe remained the source of this dangerous but alluring way of life. Americans were no longer politically attached to Britain, but they still respected—even if resentfully—European authority in matters of taste. In their manners, literature, and fashions, white Americans remained fundamentally European. They made some preliminary movements toward cultural independence. Americans tried to fashion a republican gentility by striking a balance between aristocratic luxury and Spartan austerity. European travelers found themselves on the front lines of that struggle. They led Americans to as satisfying a reconciliation between republicanism and refinement as was likely to be found, although the process took several decades.[59]

In Europe Americans encountered monarchy, aristocracy, and its symbols and personifications. As republicans they should have rejected them outright, and some did. American diplomats wished to respect conventions as they represented the young republic abroad, but they also wanted their dress to represent, as Andrew Jackson told Martin Van Buren, "the simplicity of our government founded on, and guided as it is, by pure republican principles."[60] Travelers, too, resolved to embody American principles as they encountered authoritarianism and its conventions abroad. Rituals of servility especially inflamed republican passions. Elkanah Watson's "Yankee blood flamed" when his refusal to kneel in the mud during a Catholic procession provoked a rebuke by a priest. In 1818, John T. Bowdoin allowed his "republican feelings to get the better of my judgment" when he declined to remove his hat when Louis XVIII passed him to open a session of the Chamber of Deputies. His gesture offended the French

crowd, and Bowdoin felt physically threatened. He resolved to follow local customs for the remainder of his travels, reasoning that "a trifling ceremony costs but little," and it was prudent to avoid offending local people even if their customs were repellent.[61]

For the most part Americans followed Bowdoin's wise advice, understanding that personal safety, if not civility, enjoined them to respect local conventions. Thus, when Harriet Wilson wished to mock Princesses Mary and Augusta Sophia, daughters of George III, she did so in the safety of her journal, not during her tour of Windsor Castle. She wrote that the two were "ugly women, more like house maids than ladies." Likewise, when the Duke and Duchess of Clarendon paid a visit to the University of Göttingen in 1819, George Bancroft vented in a private letter. The duke, he told his relations, struck him as "a very common sort of man in his appearance, [who] looks stupid, & is not very graceful in his movements." Even writing dismissively of the nobility left the young republican feeling tainted; Bancroft asked his mother "not to think me a foolish boy for writing about them at all." The privileged orders confounded Americans. They felt compelled to represent republicanism, but they were uncertain how to do it. Their discomfort revealed itself in the self-consciousness and occasional meanness with which they handled, and wrote about, their encounters with the great.[62]

Other travelers—those of an elitist bent—were more at ease with kings, princes, and the like. These travelers even found something positive to say about the privileged orders. Some of the so-called enlightened despots of revolutionary-era Europe earned travelers' grudging respect. Francis Kinloch maintained that, before it wrested its independence from Savoy in 1798, the Swiss Canton of Vaud had prospered under the light, albeit undemocratic, administration of a "paternal government." Now, having won their independence, Kinloch claimed that they suffered high taxes, ruined manufactories, and a greatly diminished commerce because of poor government policies. Robert C. Johnson found much to admire in the reforms of Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany from 1765 to 1790. Johnson singled out Leopold's revision of the criminal law, his clerical reforms, and his movements toward free trade. Johnson even took most unrepublican pleasure at "bowing to Ferdinand," Leopold's son, although he feared that the young man lacked both the sagacity and benevolence of his father. Un-American as these sentiments may have seemed to contemporaries, they were at best qualified violations of republican etiquette. Johnson, if not Kinloch, was not praising Leopold's despotic government so much as its results, which in the unpromising context of Napoleonic Europe was to increase freedom and opportunity as Federalist Americans understood these terms.[63]

Travelers had nothing good to say about another alleged feature of Old World privilege: aristocratic decadence. Americans debated over the boundary between dissipation and the legitimate enjoyment of wealth, but they agreed that aristocratic habits bred an immorality toxic to republican virtue. Anne Willing Bingham, one of the few Americans eager to ape the manners and morals of privileged Europe, became an infamous example of these dangers. During their 1783–86 Grand Tour, she and her husband William grasped every opportunity to mingle with the great and to be presented at courts, an obsession that became a family joke among the Adamses. Late one evening the Binghams called on Nabby Adams, who speculated that the visit was designed chiefly to let her family know that they had just dined with the Marquess of Lansdowne. Upon returning to Philadelphia, the Binghams sought to capitalize on their fame by living in aristocratic splendor and using their influence to establish a new code of privileged behavior. They built a mansion modeled after the Duke of Manchester's London house, purchased several county seats, and decorated lavishly. Most importantly, Anne Bingham spurned republican manners. She dressed provocatively, introduced a salon where women spoke on equal footing with men, and openly discussed sexuality and other subjects in defiance of conventional morality. Harrison Gray Otis, a Massachusetts Federalist who spent much time in the Binghams' circle, observed that Anne, "like the Duchess of Devonshire and other great ladies of the Court of St. James . . . besprinkled her conversation with oaths, and spiced it with facetious anecdotes." He also noted that the women of the company "did not disguise . . . their bosoms" in society. Offending even conservatives like Otis, the Binghams' plan to introduce aristocratic manners into the ruling circles of the young republic was doomed from the start.[64]

Bingham clearly miscalculated the boundary between decadence and gentility in a republican society. Americans wondered whether refinement, with its roots in European courts, could be reconciled with republicanism. Many observers on both sides of the Atlantic doubted it. An English correspondent of James Rush warned that Americans' simpler virtues were vulnerable to corruption by immigration from Europe, "where the selfishness of courtly politeness, & the follies of commercial dissipation, appear to constitute the sum of human felicity." But Jeffersonians were not the only Americans to question the wisdom of emulating European practices. Moderate Federalists also loathed the habits of aristocracy, while conservatives feared the leveling tendencies of Jacobinism. Josephine du Pont and Margaret Manigault scorned the plunging necklines, insubstantial, see-through fabrics, absence of undergarments, and sleeveless

dresses that became all the rage among fashionable women in Napoleonic Paris. These fashions, they believed, epitomized the blending of political and moral turbulence unleashed by the French Revolution.[65]

Likewise, the women of the Manigaults' circle deplored the waltz, which became popular in western Europe in the late eighteenth century. Considered scandalous because of its energy and sensuality (dancers had to hold each other very closely), the waltz nevertheless spread as social class barriers slowly became more permeable. A waltz Manigault saw in Philadelphia in 1805 "was not the sedate & decent" variety she had seen in prerevolutionary Paris, she informed her mother. She seconded her brother George's assessment that republican France "ha[d] altered the nature and corrupted it." The reports of her friend Mary Pinckney, accompanying her husband on his diplomatic mission in 1797, reinforced these fears. Although Pinckney saw it danced at a ball in Amsterdam very respectfully, she declined to allow her daughters to participate. Pinckney feared that if she allowed her daughters to engage in the harmless Dutch waltz, they might want to experiment with the French variety, which friends told her had twice the "spirit" she had seen in Amsterdam. The waltz's potential to upset multiple conventions—gender, political, social—convinced conservatives that it was best left to the Old World.[66]

The would-be American gentry did not only fear the leveling potential of French republican culture. Although they admired some aspects of aristocratic Europe, they did not wish to emulate it outright. They understood the fundamental inconsistency between aristocracy and republicanism and realized that the two could not be fully reconciled. Mary Hering Middleton, the English-born wife of Henry Middleton, articulated the gentry's ambivalence toward refinement while living in St. Petersburg with her husband, the U.S. minister to Russia. At court the Middletons enjoyed a life that proper republicans would have found scandalous and un-American. They cavorted with titled nobility, attended lavish balls and parties from which they did not return until the early hours of the morning, and spent months apart from their children, who lived with relatives in England or at exclusive boarding schools. Middleton expressed delight at the Empress's 1822 birthday party, which featured "living pictures"—famous paintings and historical scenes represented by real people. Middleton allowed that Americans might object to the expense that had been lavished on what after all was "a momentary gratification," but she thought that the party did credit to the taste of its hosts. Though their threshold for extravagance was higher than the average American's, the Middletons did find much about the Russian court objectionable to their republican sensibilities. They were particu-

larly appalled at the decadence of court life. "As to *morality*," Middleton said of Russian noblewomen, "one would suppose they did not understand the term." While she found Empress Elizabeth's conduct to be exemplary, she was shocked that among her retinue were women whose "conduct is a disgrace to their sex." Court etiquette, however, required that Middleton treat these women with all politeness. "So it is that vice meets with encouragement," she sighed.[67]

Americans said that the dissipated morals of privileged Europe were anathema to their republican culture. Travelers' behavior shows that, in practice, Americans were more accommodating to privilege. Almost nobody openly endorsed aristocracy—especially those labeled as such by the Jefferson press. In word, if not in deed, travelers preached a republican creed and pledged not to be dazzled by palaces, splendid social affairs, and exalted personages. "The blows my republican principles receive are forcible 'tis true," James Rush wrote his mother from England in 1809, "but they fall upon the wrong place and only strike them deeper." Americans' behavior tells a more complex story, however. In practice, travelers revealed a deep fascination with aristocratic Europe. Few Americans conformed willingly to the servile rituals of monarchy, and the decadence of the Old World's privileged orders repelled them. Yet by virtue of a sort of cognitive dissonance, Americans remained fascinated by aristocrats and in thrall to their code of refinement. For all their desperate efforts to fashion a national identity after the Revolution, nationalists failed to devise a compelling replacement for gentility as a guide for respectable behavior. Noah Webster, perhaps the most anxious of these cultural nationalists, saw the problem clearly. "The present ambition of Americans is, to introduce as fast as possible, the fashionable amusements of the European courts," he warned in 1787. Americans' behavior in the company of aristocrats reveals that Webster's fears were far from imaginary.[68]

Travelers expressed an admiration for great houses and palaces most unbecoming the citizens of a chaste republic. Joseph Manigault said that he derived the greatest pleasure during his 1783 tour of England from visits to country houses, particularly Hagley Hall in Worcestershire, resplendent with its picturesque landscaping. The scale and grandeur of these structures, which had no equivalent in the United States, stunned American travelers. So did a building that, even more than English country houses, represented all that republicanism stood against: Versailles. Elkanah Watson, who was not insensitive to the contrast between splendor and pauperism in France, had nothing ill to say about Versailles, which he praised for its magnificence. Visiting there in 1784, soon after Watson, Virginian John Wickham wrote that everything about it

"announced the habituation of the monarch of a great people." Only the presence of souvenir hawkers and food sellers marred the grand effect. By and large Americans did not make connections between the grandeur of these structures and the political systems that built and supported them. They reported only their sense of awe—and pleasure—that these buildings elicited. But Connecticut's Robert C. Johnson did offer some political commentary that certainly would have provoked some controversy had his confidential diary been made public. Johnson spent two full days at Versailles early in 1793, devoting special attention to its gardens, private apartments, and artworks. The palace, Johnson concluded, deserved "the highest admiration and could only have been effected by genius and taste assisted by absolute power."[69]

Travelers were also awestruck by direct exposure to fashionable European society. Although few Americans had the connections to gain access to aristocratic circles, some did so and many others eagerly sought chances to rub shoulders with the great. These behaviors suggest that many Americans accepted the legitimacy of aristocracy and other hereditary forms of status, despite their paeans to republican equality. George Ticknor was among the few travelers who sought only society that conformed to American ideals. He singled out the fashionable society of Geneva, where "wealth is often expressed here chiefly in simple hospitality." Prominent families did not devote themselves to frivolities, but strove to render themselves useful and productive. Most Americans were not so discerning. They fawned over high society (even if from a distance) and pursued every occasion to mingle in fashionable circles. Harriet Wilson's party let no social opportunities pass during their 1815 tour of England and Scotland. They were particularly pleased to attend a ball at the spa town of Leamington, a famous place where "the fashionables from all parts of the kingdom go." Even more eager to associate with the mighty was Thomas Shippen. Introducing the Pennsylvanian to Thomas Jefferson, William Stephens Smith warned that the young man was too eager to cultivate the acquaintance of titled men and women. Presented by Jefferson to the court at Versailles, Shippen was careful to tell his father that he rejoiced to be a citizen of a country where "the people respect sincerity, and acknowledge no other tyranny than that of Honor." His behavior suggests otherwise. Shippen sketched his day at court in painstaking detail. He was especially careful to mention by name or title all the persons to whom he was introduced. Shippen knew that as a citizen of a republic he was obliged to dismiss such mummery as "unnecessary and absurd," but he also clearly relished the "uncommon marks of politeness and attention" he received from the august company.[70]

The most incisive analysis of early republican infatuation with aristocracy comes from William Campbell Preston. In 1815 Albert Gallatin, the American minister at Paris, asked him to help vet the deluge of applications he received from Americans seeking tickets to a ball given by the Duke of Wellington. Preston helped establish standards for entry that allowed the Gallatins to avoid making arbitrary choices between ticket seekers. Preston was gratified at the opprobrium the attendees received from their countrymen by virtue of their "indecent and unrepublican eagerness to get into an aristocratic party." Satisfied at this result though he was, Preston was chastened by his compatriots' obsession with "exclusive circles, [and] to seek[ing] the acquaintance of distinguished and above all titled people." In their eagerness to mingle with the great, Americans behaved with a clumsiness that was anything but refined. Furthermore, it delighted Europeans by exposing their republican sentiments as a sham. It was obvious, Preston reflected, that "in regard to nobility our people have a rapturous and romantic regard for it." Forsaking republican manners but not possessing genuine refinement, American poseurs shamed themselves and their country. Not all the Americans in Paris thus degraded themselves. True patriots sought the company of Lafayette, who was only too happy to receive American visitors. Some Americans kept their republicanism keen by making a pilgrimage to the revolutionary hero. Other pilgrims worshipped at an entirely different altar—that of celebrity and aristocracy.[71]

Was Americans' obsequiousness a harmless affectation, the lengthening shadow of their colonial past, or was it more insidious? As we have seen, many travelers enjoyed mocking the pretensions of kings, priests, and other embodiments of European despotism. They also believed that aristocratic culture was inherently decadent and immoral. Preston makes clear that most Americans in Paris disdained their status-seeking compatriots. But he was deeply troubled by the minority of Americans who idolized the wellborn. This infatuation with aristocracy did not seem harmless to him. It was not only un-American; it might kill the bud of egalitarianism before it was strong enough to stand up and support itself. Gentility posed a puzzling dilemma for Americans. They struggled mightily—and with uneven success—to reconcile gentility and republicanism because of gentility's thoroughly aristocratic nature. Although travelers found much about the privileged world of Europe to be repugnant, they found other aspects of it fascinating, glamorous, and even desirable. In particular, some Americans were drawn to the exclusive world of fashionable society, which promised to distinguish the special from the ordinary, to bestow on them a cultural authority beyond mere wealth. The allure of aristocratic society was a

powerful force that might have hampered the development of American democracy.[72]

Sociability and Nationalism

With one exception, Americans' experiences in Europe tended to reinforce both their national identity and their conviction that they were a part of European civilization. That exception was sociability. Sociability may not have alienated Americans from Europe, but it did not draw them close to it, either. Rather, it drew them toward each other. Americans did not travel abroad with the intention of spending time together. They socialized with Europeans when they could. Travelers faced a number of barriers in securing foreign company, however. The most fundamental was language: few Americans spoke French, and fewer still spoke Italian, German, or the other languages of the Continent. Multilingual Americans found themselves much in demand. William C. Preston was overjoyed when his friend Hugh S. Legaré arrived in Paris having honed his French after spending the Atlantic passage in the company of Frenchmen. Americans likewise sought out William Short because of his mastery of French.[73] Besides language, most travelers also lacked the connections and social standing necessary to penetrate local social circles. Travelers begged Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte to introduce them into polite society, but she almost always refused. She had no desire to damage her credibility among Parisians by foisting "boorish Americans" on her French circle.[74] Even those with letters of introduction hesitated to impose themselves on strangers. But if travel abroad in some respects limited Americans' social aspirations, it also provided opportunities. Travel allowed Americans to meet women and men from diverse parts of the United States. Back home, these people might have seemed alien, even foreign. Being abroad, however, had the effect of magnifying those qualities Americans shared in common. Among Europeans, Americans could see with more clarity the traits that distinguished them from other peoples.

Some travelers took a more self-conscious approach to sociability, although the circumstances of travel inevitably made friends out of strangers. Joel Poinsett made fast friends with a fellow American during their 1796 Atlantic passage when they spent a night keeping watch over a mate who had gone berserk and had to be put in restraints. James Rush had barely known Jimmy Craig in their native Philadelphia, but when Craig called upon him in London in 1809, the two hit it off immediately. "Travelling has had its best effect on him," Rush

told his sister, "or we did not know him in Philad[elphia]." Americans almost always took advantage of these kinds of surreptitious encounters, but they did not sit passively and wait for them to occur. They actively sought out fellow Americans, both as a source of comfort in foreign lands and as a means to create national bonds via personal relationships. Thomas Jefferson took on the responsibility of introducing traveling Americans to each other as one of his unofficial duties as U.S. minister to Paris. Among his successes was the "triumvirate" of Thomas Lee Shippen, John Rutledge Jr., and his personal secretary William Short. Rutledge and Shippen in particular became extremely close as they traversed much of the Continent together. Shippen's acquaintance with Rutledge inspired him to sail back to the States via Savannah so he could familiarize himself with a region that, as an American, he felt compelled to see personally.[75]

Often, Americans socialized with each other with no greater purpose in mind than relieving loneliness or escaping the unfamiliar. When he visited Königsberg (now Kaliningrad) in 1820, George Bancroft only regretted that "I had with me no American friend, with whom I would share my feelings—the Germans in general are not of the melting mood." Bancroft's problem was not language. He spoke German fluently. But he was a stranger, a lone traveler, in eastern Prussia, and hence left alone to appreciate the splendors he saw. Few Americans ventured so far off the beaten track as Bancroft, however. Travelers who stuck to the conventional Grand Tour routes could expect at least some American company. George Ticknor was one of the few Americans well connected enough to circulate among a French circle while in Paris. But when they all left the capital for the summer of 1816, he was grateful to have friendships "more or less intimate among Americans." Both Robert C. Johnson and Thomas Lee Shippen circulated among an extensive circle of Americans during their European travels, but particularly in Paris. Shippen eagerly sought out the acquaintance of compatriots, even though he had access to French company. When one American introduced him to a South Carolinian boarding in his house, Shippen was delighted to find "him American in his manners and affability."[76]

As Shippen's comment suggests, Americans abroad freighted even fleeting friendships with ideological significance. It was important not only that acquaintances be friendly and compatible but that they exhibit American national character. Since the content of that character was very much up for debate in the decades after independence, Americans sought to create it in a variety of ways, including sociability. Travelers used it to will American nationality into being. It has been observed as a peculiarity of nationalism that, although citizens of even

the smallest nation will never know more than a small fraction of their compatriots, they still consider themselves to be a part of a community with binding responsibilities toward each other. Americans abroad seem to have been aware of the tenuousness of their national bonds, of the extremely imagined nature of their national community. They sought to make the imaginary real by establishing personal relationships with as many Americans as they could meet. Francis Kinloch's party had hardly arrived in Montpelier when a convalescing Virginian, expressing a "sincere and strongly expressed satisfaction, at the sight of an American family," attached himself to their group. Likewise, when Mordecai Noah visited Marseilles in 1816, he boarded at a house popular with Americans. He stayed among Americans, he explained, because only with them could he enjoy "that reciprocity of feeling and sentiment, which ever exists among compatriots." In Kinloch's and Noah's comments we can discern the importance of personal relationships in forging a sense of national identity among people who lacked the geographic, historical, and religious bonds that ordinarily, over a long period of time, establish the foundations of a national community. Having built the nation's political roof before its cultural walls, Americans abroad went about constructing those walls simply by recognizing each other as fellow nationals.[77]

Americans also used sociability to establish certain standards of behavior that would establish their national character. These efforts could sometimes take on coercive overtones. It was important that Americans represent themselves as embodiments of the supposedly universal values of their revolution and as a fully independent people. The Kentuckian William S. Dallam related an example of the former when he told of an American ship captain who in 1790 had denigrated the French government. The other Americans in Le Havre organized a meeting and issued a reprimand. The chastened captain "declared himself a wellwisher to all republics that were happy." That satisfied the convention, which "saluted him as an American and gave him our hand in token of our approbation." Dallam did not suggest that the captain's statement put him or other Americans in danger with the French government; it seems his compatriots simply judged his sentiments to be un-American. William C. Preston's experience, which epitomized Americans' dedication to promoting the United States as an equal in the community of nations, did involve trouble with the authorities. Preston and his party's nationalist hackles were raised when a band in Naples, mistaking them for Englishmen, struck up "God Save the King" in their honor. Samuel Powel and John Morgan did not care (and did not notice) when

Italians identified them not as Americans, but as Englishmen. Preston cared a lot, and said so. The musicians responded to Preston's protests by explaining that being American and English "was the same thing." Soon afterward, Preston and a companion were twice hauled into court for assault, once against a Neapolitan military officer. In both cases their interpreter told them that a claim of British citizenship would suffice to dismiss the charges, but they would only answer to the court, "We are Americans." Preston implied that incarceration—or worse—was a near thing in these scrapes, but that he was willing to brave it rather than offer a false claim of Britishness. In a foreign court, Americans took courage from each other as they asserted their national dignity.[78]

Clearly Americans took seriously the sentiments contained in Alice Izard's admonition to her son Ralph: "always pay every attention in your power to your Countrymen whom you meet abroad." Americans in Europe began to go further than creating nationality via sociability, however. They introduced the tradition of meeting together to celebrate national holidays and days of remembrance, affairs that took on greater importance for taking place on foreign soil. Ministers, chargés d'affaires, and even private citizens made it a point to gather together visiting Americans on July 4th and Washington's Birthday in order to commemorate their national community. In 1795 James Monroe held an elaborate Fourth of July gathering at his residence. He let it be known that he expected all Americans in Paris to attend, and he also invited important officials of the revolutionary government. William Dallam estimated that over one hundred Americans attended. The crowd sang "Yankee Doodle" and other patriotic songs. They drank many toasts to the republics of North America and France. "We passed the day in the greatest harmony," Dallam said. Americans did not rely on diplomats to gather them together, but did so spontaneously. During an informal gathering late that year in Rotterdam, Dallam found himself in the company of twelve Americans, so they naturally "drank many political toasts." At another surreptitious gathering of Americans in London later that year, the company drank several toasts to George Washington. That same year, John Godfrey noted that twenty or so Americans in Amsterdam met at the house of a wealthy merchant to commemorate July 4th "as all Americans ought—with much Joy & Festivity." The Americans present at these affairs emphasized the patriotic sentiments expressed by the company. Equally important, they stressed the camaraderie that reigned among the diverse group of Americans. Harmony, as much as a distinctive character, was a necessary element of nationhood. Where both were lacking, as they were in this period of nascent nationalism

and political contention, they could be willed into being—or so Americans abroad clearly believed.[79]

American travelers to Europe from the end of the War of Independence until 1820 were a fairly homogenous bunch. They tended to be wealthy and were nearly all men. To the extent that political affiliations can be gleaned, they leaned Federal. They were intensely interested in strengthening the bonds holding together the new United States of America, and they were convinced that the Constitution established the best government on earth. They wished to see the United States become a peer in the European family of nations. This cohort tended to favor Britain over France even before the Terror, and they were more sympathetic toward hierarchical forms of social order than most Americans. They were more interested in politics and institutions than society, the family, or culture. They were also cosmopolitan in outlook. Although they assumed American superiority to Europe in some respects, they were less disdainful toward the Continent than the young Englishmen who took part in the Grand Tour.[80] By and large, Americans were willing to admit that Europe was superior to the United States in some important respects, and they largely accepted as normative standards set by European elites. What Peter Onuf writes of Thomas Jefferson is true of this group at large: they "acknowledged the Americans' civilizational deficit" vis-à-vis the Old World. These perspectives shaped their view of Europe and of the place of the United States within the Atlantic community of nations. In general, they made these travelers more likely than other Americans to believe that the new nation had much to learn from Europe.[81]

Much of this would change in the next thirty years as the profile of Americans traveling to Europe evolved. Between 1820 and 1850, transatlantic travel became faster, safer, and cheaper. At the same time, a middle class with disposable income, leisure time, a commitment to democracy and egalitarianism, and a high opinion of European culture burgeoned in the United States. More people of ordinary or middling means, as well as far more women, made a trip to Europe. At the same time, an aggressive brand of spread-eagle patriotism developed. It competed with, but did not eclipse, the cosmopolitan nationalism that characterized the Early Republic. Travelers after 1820 took a broader view of Europe as they considered America's place in the Atlantic World. They placed new emphasis on family life, the status of women, living standards, gentility, and Protestant piety. Middle-class culture became the normative standard that Americans applied as they assessed their nation's place in the European community of nations.

"What we Anglo-Americans understand by the significant word comfort"

1821–1850

Between 1820 and 1860 the United States became middle class.[1] In some respects the middle class's rise drove a wedge between Europe and the American republic. Middling Americans cherished the "egalitarian myth" that maintained that any man could attain independence and even prosperity through hard work. Americans contrasted this happy state with the situation of the Old World, where (they believed) entrenched privilege, superstition, and lack of available land consigned the mass of the population to poverty and its attendant vices. Protestant piety also widened the gulf between the United States and the Continent by reinvigorating anti-Catholicism. Other than as an example of the social, economic, and political blight of Roman Catholicism, nativists argued that the countries under popery's shadow had little to offer the United States.

However, in other ways—some clear, others more subtle—the growth of a middling rank of commercial farmers, clerks, storekeepers, and professionals strengthened transatlantic bonds and reinvigorated efforts to embed the United States into what one traveler called "the civilized world."[2] Middling women and men thought of themselves as civilized people, and they wished to help spread this civilization throughout the globe. For redress they turned to the law, not personal vengeance. They invested great social and personal importance to educational institutions. They believed that people, organized into groups and motivated by an optimistic Christian faith, could transform the world for the better. They saw their government as the culmination of a long historical process of uneven but inevitable progress. They exalted high culture and personal refinement, which they also understood in historical terms. All of this compelled middling Americans to understand themselves as the heirs of various European traditions. James Fenimore Cooper's Eve Van Cortlandt gave voice to this sense of connectedness to the past when she labeled American Grand Tourists "Hajjis,"

those who have taken "the pilgrimage to Paris, instead of Mecca; and the pilgrim must be an American, instead of a Mohommedan."[3]

Europe did not represent the dead past for Americans. It was the source of fresh ideas for people who sought to transform American culture. Tocqueville observed that Americans were extremely sensitive to foreign criticism. But they could be ruthless in diagnosing their own flaws. According to Sidney George Fisher, a wellborn Philadelphia lawyer, these included poverty, vulgarity, slavery, "southernism and Yankeeism, and western barbarism, and lynch law, and mob law." He believed that America's flaws were so great that its best option was to reaffirm its historical relationship with England and "to feel proud of her glory and greatness." Fisher's diagnosis and remedy were extreme. But respectable men and women shared his conviction that Europe had much to teach Americans as they developed a civilization deserving of a place in the Atlantic community of nations. Orville Dewey, a Unitarian minister, argued that exposure to Europe gave travelers special insight into American affairs. Both sides of the Atlantic confronted the same dilemmas—"manners, national health, amusements, churches and church establishments, the Catholic religion, the cultivation of the arts, and the many and momentous questions in politics." Americans ignored European answers to these problems at their peril.[4]

Brother Jonathan Comes to Europe

Americans abroad before 1820 disagreed sharply on how the new nation should relate to Europe. However, they were overwhelmingly male and privileged, and that homogeneity limited the kinds of questions they asked about how the United States should relate to Europe. Those who thought of themselves as the American gentry still flocked to Europe after 1820. The South Carolina planter Henry Middleton, his future brother-in-law Joshua Francis Fisher, and the honeymooning Massachusetts couple Frederic and Charlotte Brinckerhoff Bronson were just a few of the self-styled aristocrats who made extended travels through Britain and the Continent. Sidney George Fisher praised his cousin's travel plans in terms that English gentlemen of the seventeenth century would have understood perfectly: "To succeed in commanding attention & engaging interest, in a distinguished and brilliant circle, is to gratify no insignificant ambition & improves the possession of qualities & acquirements, with which few are gifted." As if in mockery of these aristocratic aspirations, gentlepeople after 1820 found Europe teeming with Americans they considered their social inferiors. A companion of newlyweds Charles and Martha Amory was horrified

to rub shoulders with "common people" as they traveled on a steamer from Providence to New York, from which they sailed to Le Havre.[5]

The Amorys' experience was not an isolated one. After 1820, the social profile of Americans abroad diversified in two important respects. Many more people visited Europe whose wealth and social attitudes placed them in the growing middle ranks of the American class structure. Also, many more women made the Atlantic crossing. This period's travelers were still wealthy by American standards; a leisure trip overseas remained an expensive enterprise. John Weiss's parents scraped together the means to allow him to study theology at the University of Heidelberg in 1842–43, but they could not support even the brief tour he proposed through other parts of Europe. Ansel James McCall of Bath, New York, was close by but on the more fortunate side of this economic divide. Late in 1847 he bemoaned that strained finances made it impossible to take a European tour. But the next year McCall's fortunes improved, allowing him to accomplish his "long-cherished designs." Even better, the trip proved to be not nearly so expensive as he had anticipated.[6]

The ability of an ambitious but struggling lawyer like Ansel McCall to make a modest tour of Europe illustrates how rising incomes and cheaper travel costs enabled more Americans of middling means, including many women, to indulge their dreams—even if it consisted of just a few weeks or months abroad instead of the year or more the rich could afford. International and domestic travel became increasingly commodified in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. This process lessened both the difficulties and expenses of long-distance travel. Commodification transformed travel from a self-created activity to a service purchased from others. Early modern travel was an exhausting, challenging, and oftentimes dangerous adventure. One of the goals of the English Grand Tour was to force pampered young men to mature by throwing them into new, unfamiliar contexts that tested their character and constitution.[7] In the nineteenth century, a travel industry developed that eliminated much of the uncertainty of long-distance movement, often at the expense of excitement and spontaneity. Travelers moved along established land and water routes with fixed, advertised costs. They booked hotels instead of sharing a bed at a filthy inn.

Rather than establishing their own itinerary, travelers relied on a new genre, the guidebook, which told them where to go, what to do, and—increasingly—what they should think. The guidebooks published by the London house of John Murray were Americans' favorites. "What does Mr. Murray say? is the question that decides everything on the road," George B. Cheever, an antislavery minister, wrote in 1845. As travel became a commodity like clothing, tobacco,

and furniture, it became cheaper, more widespread, and more accessible. One critic called it the "straight-jacket mode" of travel—a system that turned the exciting and spontaneous into the conventional and banal. The fascination readers exhibited for Italian *banditti* may have been an expression of nostalgia for a more thrilling, unpredictable era of travel.[8]

Women benefited from these changes. The increasing affordability of travel made it possible for larger parties—couples, extended families, and groups of friends—to indulge in a European sojourn. Packet ships, and eventually steamers specializing in passenger travel, allowed far more people to make the passage than ever before. What is more, these vessels became ever more comfortable and eventually luxurious, allowing women to travel without violating prevailing notions of propriety. Cultural changes may also have promoted women's travel. Victorian Americans invested women with important responsibilities. The nation's moral and religious well-being was in their hands. Respectable people put great stock in women's education, which included subjects such as literature, history, belles lettres, and music. As the root source of American culture, Europe had nearly as much to offer middle-class women as it did men. In her popular *Mother's Book*, Lydia Maria Child chided American mothers for leaving adolescent girls to their own devices at just the time when they needed maternal guidance. She clinched her point when she observed that "in France, mothers always visit with their daughters." Increasingly, American women did not have to take Child at her word. They could—and did—examine European family practices for themselves.[9]

Characterizing the bulk of travelers in this period as middle class is admittedly imprecise. Most Americans could not afford a leisure trip to Europe, so travelers remained far wealthier than most of their compatriots. Being middle class in the early nineteenth-century United States was as much a state of mind as an economic condition, however.[10] These women and men were affluent, but not rich. They pursued gentility, but not aristocracy. They sought social distinction but spurned elitism. They enjoyed recreation and comfort but disdained luxury. They idealized a devout yet restrained Protestant piety, domestic happiness, and well-defined roles, both public and private, for women and men. At home, this cultural vision faced stout resistance. The gentry surrendered its prerogatives grudgingly. Yet, in only a few places, notably South Carolina, did they remain ascendant.[11] Poor folk in urban areas and the countryside more successfully maintained a distinct culture that included religious fatalism, ribald forms of recreation, and a strong ethic of masculine honor.[12] While the middle-class ethic was challenged at home, among travelers to Europe it was nearly hege-

monic. Their numbers simply dwarfed the few aristocrats, and even fewer working people, sailing and steaming to Europe.

Scholars have struggled to define the middle class with precision, but privileged travelers knew that a new type of American had invaded their turf in the museums, cafes, and promenades of Europe. Henry Middleton, the South Carolina planter, wrote his sister from Paris in 1836 to complain that the city was "crowded at present with a perfect rabble of Jonathans." Middleton was plainly embarrassed by what he considered the "incurably underbred habits and vulgar tone" of his countrymen. Moreover, he feared that Europeans would conflate gentlemen like himself with these rude, loud parvenus. Middleton's future brother-in-law Joshua Francis Fisher also scorned most of the Americans he met during his residence in Paris in the early 1830s. Their social awkwardness, ignorance of world affairs, and vulgar habits mortified him. When his European associates and like-minded American friends were away from the city, he grew despondent. He told his uncle late in 1830 that there were hardly any "young Americans in Paris whose society is bearable."[13]

Middleton's and Fisher's frustration with their compatriots is understandable. These young gentlemen had little in common with the new breed of American traveler. Their very reasons for going abroad differed sharply. The gentry saw European travel as their opportunity to shine in brilliant companies, to acquire the poise that would enable them to assume the positions of social and political leadership they took to be their due. Few Americans had such aristocratic aspirations. Instead, they saw a European visit as an opportunity for individual and national improvement. Nationally, "improvement" meant the qualitative development of the United States into a powerful, integrated state tied together by a common national vision and economic complementarity. Its citizens would be upwardly mobile strivers free to seek happiness through education, self-control, and personal merit. The benefits of European travel were understood in these terms. "I view Europe only as a School of improvement," wrote Georgian Mary Telfair as she arrived in London in 1842. True to her word, she returned to Savannah improved in a variety of ways. She was a "better Presbyterian," having seen Catholic mummery and Anglican formality; a "better Republican" for having seen the foppery of aristocracy; and a "better American" overall for acquiring a better perspective on the relative virtues of Europe and the United States. Even if the net result of her journey was to enhance her patriotism—as it was for so many of her compatriots—Telfair took much from Europe, both as an individual and as a citizen. Europe was like a fascinating new friend, she wrote to Mary Few, "full of new and brilliant ideas."[14]

The improvement ethic compelled travelers to ask different questions and to establish different priorities than privileged people. Most obviously, travelers busied themselves looking for signs of progress—economic development, technological innovation, prosperity—wherever they went. They noted where these qualities seemed to be absent or in retreat. Additionally, Americans paid close attention to private morals, the status of women, and family life. Middle-class people had very definite ideas about what was appropriate in these areas, and they expected Europeans to conform. Older concerns did not disappear, however. Americans continued to be simultaneously fascinated with and repelled by aristocracy and royalty. After 1820, however, that tension played out in the context of debates about the propriety of gentility in a republican society. Victorian Americans were even more fascinated by the Roman Catholic Church than their predecessors had been. Travelers continued to seek cultural and historical connections with Catholic art. But to a greater extent than before, Americans delved more deeply into Catholic piety and church-state relations. With evangelical Protestantism striking deep roots in American society—and with Catholic immigration on the rise—Romanism seemed less like an antiquarian interest and more like a danger to the republic.

The United States, Europe, and the Gospel of Progress

Americans were largely interested in establishing connections between themselves and Europe. It was important to them that they demonstrate that Europe and the United States were on the same historical trajectory. For middle-class Americans, that trajectory was neatly encapsulated by the concept of "progress." Like its related term "improvement," progress had a complex meaning. It was understood to mean material improvement, such as better living standards, longevity, childhood health, and material prosperity. It also represented a more abstract sense of moral betterment, which in turn was usually linked to an unfolding divine plan. Middling Americans believed that people could help realize God's design by consciously developing their moral and material surroundings. This millennial belief had a strong nationalist dimension. Its adherents believed that God intended to bring His plans to fruition in the United States. Yet this vision was also deeply international. Postmillennial Americans believed that the United States would be God's vehicle for the redemption of the world. They eagerly looked for signs that Europe was joining the United States on its progressive path.[15]

Travelers agreed that there was one area in which Europe lagged frustratingly behind the United States: poverty. As we have seen, postrevolutionary Americans abroad found living standards across Europe to be well below what they believed to be the standard among free people in the United States. Americans amplified and extended those observations after 1820. Although travelers were correct to observe that living standards in the Old World were well below those at home, and that in certain parts of Europe vagrancy and beggary were commonplace, they did not stop there.[16] Convinced that Europe and the United States should be on the same course of improvement, travelers struggled to explain this glaring difference between the Old and New Worlds. They developed what the historian Edward Pessen labeled the "egalitarian myth." They believed that the United States was dominated by people of ordinary means; that few people were very poor or very rich; that upward mobility was available to all, according to merit; and that, in such a fluid society, class barriers were all but irrelevant. While Americans were open to the idea that Europe had much to teach the United States, in this case travelers' writings reinforced popular beliefs about American superiority and emphasized the distance between the Old World and the New.[17]

No part of Europe escaped from travelers' eye for poverty, although some areas came across worse than others. England and Scotland fared the best. Her travels in Italy, where she was inundated with beggars, led the Anglo-American actress Fanny Kemble to say, "When I think of England and America, I thank God that I was born in one and shall live in the other." Other travelers, however, did not hesitate to lump Britain with the rest of Europe. The New Hampshire–born abolitionist Parker Pillsbury told his family that for the British poor, "Society has petrified itself into a most cheerless, hopeless form." Henry Colman, a Massachusetts agricultural reformer and an Anglophile, also found English poverty to be without parallel in the United States. In highly emotive language, Colman wondered how a poor family could make ends meet in Britain after seeing "human nature, lying in bleeding fragments" in Edinburgh and Manchester. Not surprisingly, travelers reserved their choicest adjectives to describe poverty in Ireland. Frederick Gale thought that the countryside around Newry, about sixty-five kilometers north of Dublin, was the most desolate landscape he had ever seen. He could not fathom how its miserable inhabitants could even draw sustenance from the "barren, cold, rocky, boggy, & unpromising" soil. The plight of Ireland's poor even moved the unsentimental James Henry Hammond, who estimated that he doled out to Irish beggars five times as much as he had in France and Italy when he visited Europe in 1837.[18]

Hammond aside, most Americans believed that Europe's most wretched conditions were to be found to the south. Their letters and diaries from Spain, Italy, and parts of France burst with references to men, women, and children living in the most desperate conditions. John A. Clark's party had no sooner crossed from Gibraltar into Spain than a crowd of desperate-looking beggars "pounced upon us like a gang of hungry wolves." Josephine Eppes, of Appomattox Manor, Virginia, reported being thronged by beggars, mainly "black eyed roguish looking children," in a village outside Naples early in 1851. The spectacle of a crowd of vagrants—"one-legged, armless, and otherwise deformed"—fighting for sous around his diligence aroused Ohioan Samuel Cox to wonder how such a thing could be possible in the lush Rhône valley. Travelers reported seeing fewer evidences of economic development in Europe's south, which made its poverty seem more extreme than the north's. Daniel Aiken thought that the landscape outside Rome was the bleakest, most depressing country he had ever laid eyes on because while the land seemed full of potential, it was almost completely underdeveloped. Likewise, in Spain, John Clark observed "evidences of a blighting curse upon the land" in the "neglected tillage, the deserted fields, and ruined dwellings." American travelers found European poverty to be as commonplace as it was disconcerting.[19]

These writings became important sources for the development of the myth of American egalitarianism. The credibility that travelers possessed by virtue of their firsthand experiences in Europe lent authority to celebrations of American equality. Catharine Sedgwick, assaulted by crowds of beggars near Liege, coolly noted that "a sight it is quite as novel to our New World eyes as a cathedral or a—police-man." Like other travelers, Sedgwick did not merely contribute evidence of European poverty to the egalitarian myth. Rather, she and other Americans abroad developed it as fully as Tocqueville had in *Democracy in America*. In 1841, New Yorker James Colles, who had come from humble origins, was shocked by the stark contrast between the opulence of the rich and the desperation of the poor in England, who barely seemed to earn the cost of their sustenance. Colles concluded, "We have but few cases of such extremes in our own country, every man can if industrious earn a living and make himself respectable, long may it continue." As Colles suggested, Americans were not unaware of the presence of distress at home.[20] However, in this case nationalist ideology made it difficult for successful Americans to confront the depths of poverty in the States. It conflicted too sharply with their image of their home country. Few travelers appreciated—or could appreciate—the deplorable state of widowed laundresses, workers in the garment industry, or manual workers digging out

canals and deepening harbors with shovels.[21] Nevertheless, visitors to Europe were not completely blind to America's economic flaws. They interpreted the contrast between European inequality and American egalitarianism in relative, not absolute, terms. Traveling from Ballyshannon in northern Ireland in 1844, North Carolinian Octavia Jones reflected, "Who can look upon a country where . . . the 'people are eating one another up' and not feel the blessings of Providence in living and moving and having been in such a land as America. Happy, proud America! Land of the free—with her ten thousand faults, I love her still, I love her still."[22]

"Ten thousand faults"—this was an egalitarian myth, but a qualified one. Sophisticated women and men knew that the myth of American equality distorted a more complex reality. When George Jacques came upon crudely nationalistic travel letters in the Worcester, Massachusetts, *Spy*, he wasted little time in deflating their hot air. The "naked children" of Naples not only had their equivalent on the South's plantations, he wrote, but the poor whites of the piney woods and Appalachians constituted an "*American lazzaroni*—thieves, ruffians, assassins, banditti." Henry T. Tuckerman, who had traveled widely in Italy, also took issue with condescending American accounts. He charged "puritanic" northerners, in particular, with contrasting an idealized United States with a crude caricature of Italy. Other travelers were not insensitive to signs of economic well-being in Europe. Anne Bullard of St. Louis parroted the usual Anglo-American prejudices toward Italy, but Turin surprised her. It boasted wide, straight, clean streets with well-built, spacious houses. The poor, she was told, were hardworking and honest, which squared with her own observations: "We saw few beggars and little apparent poverty." Travel forced Henry Colman to reconsider his assumptions about France. They were not the pleasure-loving, work-averse race he had expected, but a serious and industrious people living at a high state of civilization. French cities contrasted favorably with London, where "hunger, and squalor, and drunkenness, and filth, and wretchedness, crowd upon you at every corner." Bullard's and Colman's travels did not jar them out of their complacency about living conditions in the United States, but it did force them to realize that equality was not a uniquely American virtue. Ohio's Samuel Cox was blunter. He challenged his compatriots to see the lush fields of Lombardy and not "confess that the man of industry and energy is not alone an American nor a Republican."[23]

Those qualifications aside, poverty and inequality were among the areas in which European travel reinforced, instead of undermining, the pillars of American exceptionalism. Why was that so, given the visibility of poverty in the United

States, the prominence of rich men in society and in political office, and the widening gap between the rich and poor? Partly, the myth of American egalitarianism was an attractive national conceit, appealing to patriots, immigrants, and Anglophobes alike. More was at work here than ideology, however. Behind the caricature of American egalitarianism lay some important differences between Europe and the United States. The distribution of wealth in the United States was hardly equal, but it was more so than Europe's. Particularly in the rural north, wealth was relatively evenly distributed, with the rural west being the most egalitarian. Wealth accumulation was closely related to age and race.[24]

European poverty also exhibited itself in ways unfamiliar to Americans, which made it seem far worse. Beggars and vagrants, while not unknown in the United States, were a common sight throughout Europe.[25] The grand palaces and country houses of the aristocracy also made European poverty seem more extreme than in the United States. Fanny Kemble noted that Butler Place, her rich husband's estate outside Philadelphia, was no more than a "second-rate farm house in England, not like an English mansion or estate at all," although the city's gentry thought of it like one. C. Edwards Lester was among the Americans struck by the contrast between "princely wealth and abject poverty, of lordly power and cringing servility" in Europe.[26] The grandeur of European aristocracies—their palaces and great houses, pomp and power, and sense of entitlement—made the plight of the European poor seem far worse than the American variety. Finally, when Americans spoke of equality, they meant more than income and wealth. Egalitarianism signified a constellation of qualities—social mobility, suffrage, economic opportunity, legal equality—that were present in the United States to a greater degree than in Europe. Parochial nationalism certainly explains much of the appeal of the egalitarian myth. Nevertheless, travelers' observations of the relative egalitarianism of the United States vis-à-vis Europe rested on a sound empirical foundation.[27]

Egalitarianism highlighted the differences between the Old and New Worlds, but other areas of travelers' experience called forth the connections. Counterintuitively, antiquity—a characteristic widely supposed to distinguish the Old World from the New—was one of these areas. Americans in Europe found themselves surrounded by the past. Much of it was alive—many of its old palaces, churches, and urban districts still throbbed with life—but much of it was not. Travelers scrambled across ruined castles, walked around the remains of the Roman Forum, and marveled at Stonehenge. Europe simply was old in a way that the United States was not, which was an important source of its fascination.

Travelers creatively used Europe's antiquity to heighten its meaning for the much younger United States, but, not surprisingly, not all did so. Some Americans reduced Europe to antiquity. It was a land rooted in the past—old works of art, backward forms of government, gothic cathedrals, superstition. Eliza Quitman, whose husband John left her behind when he went across the Atlantic seeking investment capital for a Mississippi railroad in 1839, imagined herself by her husband's side, "visiting those ruins of castles, and the numberless curiosities which present themselves continually to your view." This was the Europe of the antiquarian traveler. It was a quaint place, full of garishly dressed peasants, gothic cathedrals, battlefields, and relics of an interesting, but desiccated, past. It had nothing to teach the Americas.[28]

More thoughtful travelers were certain that European antiquity was full of lessons for the United States. They agreed with Mrs. Quitman that Europe represented the past. But that orientation admonished Americans in a number of ways, if they would listen. The Democratic journalist John O'Sullivan maintained that the United States had no interest in "scenes of antiquity," except as "lessons of avoidance of nearly all their examples." Italy, with its riches of Roman ruins, inspired the most reflections on this subject. The contrast between the might of the empire and poor, divided modern Italy proved to be irresistible. The South Carolina planter-politician James Henry Hammond lamented the "sad degeneracy" that Rome had sunken into under papal misrule. Relatively few travelers, however, looked upon antiquity as an opportunity to reinforce smug notions of American exceptionalism. Antiquity's meaning for the United States was more complex. William Gillespie, a New York engineer visiting Rome in 1843–44, thought that the contrast between past and present should humble Americans. Ancient Rome deserved its fate because of its record of conquest and cruelty. Even an antiquarian had to admit that the coliseum's transformation from a scene of "murderous contests" to a Christian shrine was an improvement. He challenged Americans to do better, but he doubted they could—Gillespie was sure they would see the coliseum only as a venue for a mass political meeting.[29]

The more common lesson drawn from ruins, castles, and the like was not nationalistic at all—it was cosmopolitan. Travelers lamented Europe's dark past because they wanted it and the United States to be carried along by the same current of progress. The sobering lessons of antiquity applied to both sides of the Atlantic. Abram David Pollock, a Virginian Presbyterian minister, and Frederick W. Gale, from Worcester, made this point. In the "ancient & venerable pile" of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, Gale was scandalized to discover old

banners and armaments, including "a throat-cutting *sword*!" In Normandy some time later, Gale caught himself indulging in romantic images of medieval knighthood. Shaken out of his reverie, the Massachusetts traveler reminded himself that knights were a "race of bullies" whose bloodthirsty code was incompatible with the modern age. The great cathedral at Rouen inspired Pollock's ruminations on antiquity. While grand beyond description, the cathedral nevertheless represented for the Virginian "the history of the dark ages, the night of time," its presence in the contemporary world connecting its "story of human ignorance & superstition & mental & moral bondage and military ambition & kingly strife back through many Centuries." Only recently was the social gloom epitomized by the cathedral beginning to lift. Antiquity was not to be romanticized, but reviled—for America's sake, but also for Europe's.[30]

Because antiquity called to mind European-American differences, travelers chose to focus on signs of modernity. Americans continued to use Edinburgh's New Town as their favored example of Europe's progress, perhaps because the adjacent medieval districts of the city put the New Town's modernity in especially sharp relief. John Edward Doyle of Norfolk, Virginia, appreciated the "picturesque confusion" of buildings in the Old Town but singled out the New Town for the symmetry of its streets and the "chaste and classic design" of its buildings, all of which complemented the respectable character of its inhabitants. During his 1823–24 travels, John Carter Brown spent a day in Edinburgh, almost all of which he dedicated in the New Town. Like Doyle, he singled out the order and spaciousness of the planned streets. Other travelers focused more closely on the Old Town. Looking down on the city from the perspective of Edinburgh Castle, Duncan Farrar Kenner, a serious young Louisianan, got a sense of the order and beauty of the New Town, an impression confirmed when he walked through the Old. Its houses had "not that clean & neat appearance they have in the new city," he wrote. The quaint streets of the medieval city only impressed the Reverend John Clark, rector of St. Andrew's church in Philadelphia, as "receptacles of filth and laboratories of 'villainous smells.'" The less picturesque but more modern part of the city presented a perfect contrast: prosperous, clean, orderly. Edinburgh's Old and New Towns provided travelers with more than a stark illustration of the division between antiquity and modernity. It represented a moral geography as well, testimony to the spiritual and material superiority of the modern age.[31]

Edinburgh's Old and New Towns provided a natural juxtaposition of new and old, but travelers remarked on signs of modernity wherever they found them. Orville Dewey suggested Dublin, with its ordered streets and fine public

squares, as a potential model for American cities. The almost medieval confusion of New York and Boston might epitomize American individualism and spontaneity, Dewey conceded. Yet he suggested that a city like Dublin, built like Philadelphia upon a "regular and well-considered plan," would "improve, humanize, and elevate the ideas of a people." A new century called for a self-consciously moral urban landscape. John H. Martinstein, a New Orleans businessman visiting relatives in northern Germany in 1835, was consistently surprised by the signs of progress he saw there. Bremen impressed him most of all, with its straight, wide streets and buildings "all well and handsomely built in modern style." Few Americans disparaged antiquity altogether. Nor did they wish modernity to sweep all before it. Americans liked Europe best when they could balance its antiquity against signs that it was moving triumphantly forward with them into the future. The problem with places like Edinburgh's Old Town was that they had not left antiquity where it belonged—in the past. Daniel Aiken of South Carolina expressed this appreciation for past and present when he commented on a railway—the very symbol of progress—passing through a long tunnel on its way through the lovely natural scenery around the spa town of Matlock Bath, England. It epitomized "the majesty of nature, and the persevering industry of art." Americans expected modernity not to annihilate the past—represented by either untamed nature or antiquity—but to perfect it.[32]

Americans' understanding of antiquity was echoed in another standard bit of tourist fare: their appreciation for grand scenes of nature. Visiting great battlefields, ruined castles, and cathedrals compelled Americans, nationally and individually, to feel humbled in historical time and to situate themselves in the stream of European history. Breathtaking natural scenery also led travelers to locate themselves, but in nature rather than time. An appreciation for the glories of the environment was one of the habits that genteel people (and those who wished to be seen as genteel) adopted to distinguish themselves from common folk in the antebellum decades. It was not enough merely to visit scenes of natural splendor, though that was essential. The traveler had to express the appropriate sentiments and emotions. The aesthetic pleasure elicited by mountains, waterfalls, gorges, and the like, was straightforward enough. The most cultivated travelers, though, sought after a higher level of experience called the sublime: a feeling that combined awe, terror, and beauty in a combination whose effect was not horrifying, but ennobling and improving. Rather than teach the individual's insignificance in the universe, the sublime developed the witness's appreciation for nature's majesty and the genius of creation.[33]

Americans did not need to go overseas to experience the sublime. In the 1820s developers made Niagara Falls into the centerpiece of a "fashionable tour" that appealed to the growing cohort of middle-class travelers wishing to experience nature in its epic (but safely accessible) form.[34] But once abroad, visitors felt compelled to witness the splendors of the European landscape. Like so much else, even nature became a tool in some Americans' nationalistic constructions of themselves vis-à-vis Europe. "Our noble Hudson compares most favorably with the 'majestic Rhine,'" remarked Kate Gansevoort, a young New Yorker, in 1859. Yet all but the most knee-jerk patriots conceded that Europe had more than its share of sites of awe-inspiring nature. Travelers did not necessarily value these places better because they were in the Old World, but few considered a trip there complete without contemplating directly the Alps, the Scottish highlands, or some other appropriately wild, forlorn, or majestic wonder. Words could not express "the remotest idea of the beautiful, grand, & terrific scenery through which we passed," wrote North Carolina's Kate Jones of her 1851 Alpine passage from Basel to Berne. "I feel as if a whole life of emotions were compressed into that day." She was uninterested in the kinds of comparisons that, in the hands of other visitors, exalted American over European nature (or, less often, the other way around). In fact, travelers tended to be judicious in assessing the natural scenery of the United States and Europe. "We boast not indeed of Alps rising on Alps," a New Yorker conceded. Rather, the emotions Jones felt—the sense of being simultaneously part of and dwarfed by nature—confirmed her and other Americans' membership in a transatlantic community of gentility.[35]

Americans were keenly interested to see whether Europeans shared their enthusiasm for what Frederick Gale called "these days of improvement"—efforts to better, or even perfect, the world through the work of benevolent organizations. After 1815, Americans banded together in hundreds of reform societies dedicated to stamping out a myriad of ills, including poverty, illiteracy, slavery, impiety, and intemperance. The most optimistic reformers sought not only to improve American society but to perfect it—to purge it of sin. When reformers traveled abroad, they made connections with like-minded people wherever they went, establishing what came to be called a "benevolent empire" that transcended national boundaries. Emma Willard made a careful study of educational practices in Britain and France during her 1830–32 tour. Lucretia Mott reached out to reformers during her visit to England for the world antislavery convention in 1840, as did Frederick Douglass five years later. Valentine Mott focused on mak-

ing himself familiar with medical and surgical innovations during his nearly six years overseas.[36]

Interest in reform was not restricted to activists, however. Ordinary Americans also took an interest in European efforts. On the Atlantic crossing they petitioned their captain and fellow passengers to enforce a dry ship, and while in Europe they visited schools, orphan asylums, and hospitals. They hoped to confirm that Europeans shared their reforming zeal, but they were also keen to learn innovations they could apply at home. These investigations strengthened bonds between the United States and Europe, but they did so unevenly. The especially vigorous reform culture of England and Scotland reinforced a growing sense of Anglo-American commonality. The comparatively weaker reform traditions of Catholic Europe accentuated cultural differences between those areas and the United States. Nevertheless, Americans did not write off those parts of Europe. They picked up on the tiniest scraps of evidence to show that all Europe—even Italy and Spain—was joining with the United States and Great Britain in embracing the middle-class ethic of progress. Some parts of continental Europe even seemed ahead of America. Virginian Levin Joynes opined that Americans could learn a lot from studying the educational systems and charities of France and Prussia, and even those of the "little state" of Berne, Switzerland. At the very least some knowledge of what the Old World was doing in these areas would throw cold water on smug American preconceptions about "benighted Europe," Joynes thought.[37]

Reform tourism was not on the agenda of all Americans abroad. Nor did travelers unite in avoiding drink and other dubious practices. Nathaniel Ames, an American sailor in 1820s London, likened British dairy inspectors to "proscriptive and persecuting" anti-Masons. Even the abolitionist Parker Pillsbury loosened up and drank wine while in London in the 1840s.[38] Nevertheless, guidebook publishers recognized travelers' interest in reform and featured points of interest prominently in their publications. Stephen Salisbury II attended church services at Liverpool's School of Industry for the Indigent Blind during his 1829–31 Grand Tour, where the students' choral music deeply moved him. So impressed was he that he bought his mother a bag woven by the pupils as a souvenir. In 1847 Henry Colman visited an insane asylum outside Paris. He credited the institution with raising "hundreds of poor creatures from a condition of the deepest degradation, filth, squalidness, and bestiality, to a condition of cleanliness, comfort, and order." Travelers also sought out individual reformers in order to assess the progress of their work. In Athens, Valentine Mott found

an old friend, a devoted Episcopal minister on a mission to Greece after its long Turkish occupation. "The history of our own countrymen has, indeed, ever been the history of an enterprising and daring race of adventurous men, constantly occupied in colonization," Mott concluded.[39]

Social reform has usually been identified as a northern activity, but travelers from the slave states were deeply interested in European benevolence. Virginia's James Minor Glassell visited Liverpool's blind asylum several years before Stephen Salisbury, where he was impressed by the pupils' handiwork and musical skill. Southerners did not seek out the company of antislavery Europeans, but neither did ordinary American travelers. Both northerners and southerners were keen to understand how Europe was engaged along with them in the broad mainstream of reform, including Christian missions, poor relief, and temperance. In 1841, Abram Pollock went to hear the well-known Scot John Abercrombie speak about his medical missionary endeavors in China. The presence of Abercrombie's American collaborator, Peter Parker, made the event doubly interesting to the North Carolinian as an example of Anglo-American cooperation. Occasionally, southerners were even interested in more controversial reform efforts. Duncan Kenner paid homage to the statue of the penal reformer John Howard in St. Paul's Cathedral, but he also praised a more controversial figure, Robert Owen. Kenner spent a day in New Lanark, the model village developed by Owen and his father-in-law. Owen was often criticized for his utopian schemes, but Kenner was impressed by the workers' housing, as well as the kind remembrances of Owen offered by the inhabitants.[40]

As the preceding accounts make clear, travelers found the most vigorous reform traditions in England and Scotland. Reform tourism strengthened the sense of Anglo-American kinship that had been developing since the close of the War of 1812. The United States and Britain, it seemed, were engaged in the same civilizing mission. John Griscom, the educational reformer, was incensed by the pettiness of the Paper War precisely because it frustrated what he assumed was the natural tendency of Great Britain and the United States to collaborate on human betterment based on their common interests, language, and culture. As movements for reform grew on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1830s and 1840s, these sentiments deepened.[41] Pliny Earle, a Massachusetts Quaker studying medicine in Paris, fell into the reformist circle of Englishwoman Elizabeth Fry in 1837. Fry, a prison reformer, organized Britons and Americans into a movement to improve French morals. At one meeting she described the appalling moral state of France, reminding the assembly not just of the methods by which the English and American residents might reach out to Parisians, but "of

their duty to do it." Britons and Americans recognized in each other a shared cultural core based on reformist Protestantism. "Unite Britain and America in energetic and resolved cooperation for the world's salvation," wrote two British Congregationalists in 1836, "and the world is saved!" Fifteen years later Samuel Cox echoed those sentiments. He predicted that "the increase of Anglo-Saxon power" would spread the practical, useful, can-do spirit of the Anglo-Americans, as well as "a spirituality more divine than the soul," across the globe.[42]

Reform impulses highlighted deepening ties between Britain and the United States, but Americans did not despair for the Continent. They believed that the spread of benevolent enterprise across the Channel would bring all of Europe's peoples into the current of improvement. The signs were there already. Many visitors considered Paris, not London, to be the capital of Western civilization. Travelers marveled at Paris's public charities, especially its hospitals for the indigent like Les Invalides. Both France and the United States, wrote Isaac Appleton Jewett, "look forward to the same great ends—the development and highest condition of the universal people." Even those parts of Europe Americans thought were most backward—southern Italy and Spain—were redeemable. Colonization advocate Elliott Cresson was delighted to discover a Lancasterian orphanage in Naples in 1826. When Henry T. Cheever visited Spain with his invalid brother in 1835, he brought with him a box of bibles and tracts. Cheever maintained that "even in bigoted Spain, the theatre of the bloody tragedies of the inquisition," just twenty-five dedicated missionaries could break the "chains of the spiritual despotism by wh[ich] this people are held in bondage." To convince their readers that continentals were capable of reform, travelers grappled with American deference to English opinion. British travel writers denigrated Italians as lazy and corrupt. Margaret Fuller admonished Americans to develop their own opinions instead of deferring to the "illiberal, bristling" views of English writers on Italian affairs. Fuller expected more from Americans because of their revolutionary tradition. It was incumbent on them to exhibit a "better, warmer feeling" toward people struggling for liberty, she argued.[43]

Fuller and other travelers insisted that Italy and Spain could be redeemed from despotism and Catholic superstition. In its own way, this view was as condescending as the English opinions Fuller deprecated. Reformers did not accept Spaniards and Italians on their own terms, but as peoples needful and capable of improvement. Still, reform travelers were eager to welcome Europeans into the progressive mainstream of Victorian civilization. Because Britain and the United States shared a vigorous reform tradition, benevolent tourism

strengthened Anglo-American bonds and contributed to what would become the racial and cultural concept of Anglo-Saxonism. But appreciating Britain did not entail disparaging the Continent. Travelers maintained that France, already the pinnacle of European civilization, was ready to embrace reform, and Italy and Spain were ripe for deliverance. Europe's poverty and rigid social systems enhanced feelings of national exceptionalism, but American travelers energized by the spirit of improvement saw Europe ultimately as their partner, not an adversary, in their mission to reform the world.

Private Lives, National Virtues

Americans remained fascinated by palaces, museums, cathedrals, and other public spaces. To a much greater degree than they had in the past, however, travelers sought to understand the private lives of Europeans—their manners and morals, their domestic arrangements, and their family relationships, including the status of women. Middle-class people placed great emphasis on family life as the foundation of a healthy republican society. Women were primarily responsible for the maintenance of the family, which gave them considerable influence in society.[44] Travelers looked into Europeans' private affairs carefully. The most inconsequential flaw, the most innocent expression of national character, might reveal a society's fundamental merits or defects. Isaac Appleton Jewett, for example, extrapolated from the popularity and excellence of Parisian restaurants the weakness of French domesticity. Strong families dined at home, with meals prepared by a dedicated mother and wife. Thus, those who considered the home the true "nursery of private, and in their development, of public virtues," Jewett argued, would judge the United States and Britain far ahead of the French. Private life was the area of Europe Americans found most difficult to access. Language barriers and lack of contacts necessitated that their observations were often superficial, the expression of existing preconceptions and prejudices. And when they did attain access, few travelers possessed the insight into foreign societies to understand what they saw. Americans were undeterred by these barriers, however, even when they were aware of them. As a result, travelers' observations of European domestic habits drew them closer to Britain and away from the countries of the Continent.[45]

Americans worried that Europe would corrupt them. Thomas Jefferson had thought so too, but his fears were political: republicanism would be corrupted by aristocracy. Antebellum travelers were more concerned by private morals, especially sexual indulgence. Prolonged exposure to the Continent would draw

young men away from the pillars of middle-class respectability—family, church, and productive employment. Women, who almost never traveled without male company, were assumed to be less vulnerable to corruption. It was the rare family that did not fret for the moral health of traveling sons. Martha Richardson told her nephew, "I would not keep you from a knowledge of vice," but she hoped he would not indulge so deeply that he would spurn the path of righteousness. Most advice givers thought it was best to avoid temptation altogether. As her son Stephen set off on an extensive tour, Elizabeth Salisbury implored him to shun sinfulness. She admonished her young son to "resist temptation and return to your widow'd mother improved in every venture which can adorn the man—fix'd or established in religious principles." Young men tried to reassure their families on this point. Joshua Francis Fisher told his mother that every day he spent in Paris taught him to appreciate the "worldly advantage & pleasure that is to be derived from religion and virtue." Although as an explorer of sorts he felt compelled "to visit many of the haunts of vice," he reassured his mother—not very convincingly—that they would "offer no allurements" for him.[46]

Americans struggled to explain the extent of crime, prostitution, sexual license, and other forms of vice they saw abroad. Henry Colman saw things in Edinburgh's slums he hesitated to describe in print lest the paper become "absolutely offensive to the touch." Poverty was to blame, he concluded: only "the most disgusting and loathsome forms of destitution" could explain the depths of depravity he witnessed. Charles Rockwell, a U.S. Navy chaplain, thought that standing armies, and the monarchies they supported, created a demand for mass, almost institutionalized, vice. Separated at a young age from family and community, soldiers became corrupted by their comrades, resulting in "a kind of systematic and licensed concubinage, as directly opposed to the principles of morality as it is to the cultivation of all the higher social and domestic virtues." Few Americans failed to blame the Catholic Church for the Continent's low moral state. John Clark specifically blamed Rome for corrupting Europe's women. Catholicism—what Clark called "Heathenism and paganized Christianity"—reduced women to the level of a slave, he explained. Only Protestantism elevated women to "the sphere for which she was intended by her Creator." Travelers' favored explanations for European vice—poverty, militarism, and Catholicism—served to underscore the distance between the Old and New Worlds.[47]

Although Americans were chiefly concerned that travel might corrupt young men, Clark's observation indicates that women were not safe from Europe's moral taint. Women were not considered, as were men, to be prone to seduction. Rather, it was feared that the glamour of high society would beguile them. The

danger was not so great in places like Italy and Spain, which Americans experienced mainly as tourists, but in Britain and France, where they were more likely to gain entrée into polite society. Visiting Paris in 1848, the novelist Caroline Kirkland gave voice to American fears when she characterized the city as one of "discontent and unsound principles; of bold and heartless show; of gaudy pretenses." France was considered to be a place of special danger to women. Sundays in Paris, featuring low church attendance, open shops, and a festive atmosphere, made the French seem shockingly irreligious. Jane Anthony Eames, a pious Massachusetts tourist, exclaimed, "How unlike Sunday it seemed! How little there was to designate the holy day." More threatening than impiety, however, were Parisian marital relations. Married women and men routinely took lovers, a habit that shocked respectable Americans who idealized monogamy. Henry Middleton feared that exposure to Parisian society led American women to see sexual modesty as a sign of vulgarity, and promiscuity as a proof "of great elegance and refinement!" Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte, whose aristocratic manners and risqué fashions so scandalized her compatriots, personified the threat France posed for upstanding American women.[48]

The moral condition of European women was alarming in its own right, but also because it undermined what middling Americans understood to be the foundation of national health: the home. The seat of wholesome domesticity, the home offered the family a refuge from the soulless world of the marketplace and the corruptions of fashionable life. Its weakness had troubling implications for a people's capacity for improvement. The comforts of home, travelers concluded, were especially rare on the Continent. James Colles told his son that the paucity of firewood in Paris made life in the wintertime unpleasant for Americans who had "always enjoyed the comforts of a *warm fire side*." Colles understood "comfort" to be a moral and physical condition, not merely a happy medium between want and luxury. So did Valentine Mott, who warned his readers that, in Italy, very few homes could be found with "what we Anglo-Americans understand by the significant word comfort." Henry Cheever observed much the same thing when he came upon a family home outside Malaga, Spain, in 1835. The house was a long way from exhibiting the kind of "thriving housewifery & substantial comfort & connivance wh[ich] is to be seen in the farm-houses of New England." The main room featured a few primitive chairs and a dirt floor, but Cheever focused, more importantly, on what was missing: "no whitewashed wall, no nicely sanded floor; no varnished clock that click'd behind the door." Cheever was not primarily calling attention to the lack of consumer items, though that was part of his indictment. His account underscored the moral dis-

tance between Spain and the United States. The house's slovenly appearance epitomized the frailty of middle-class domesticity in Catholic Europe.[49]

In the homes of Scotland and England travelers found evidence for a transatlantic community of values. As he sailed down the River Severn on his way to Bristol, John Doyle cast his eyes on the common appearances of "comfort" found everywhere throughout England, chiefly "the pretty Cottage . . . giving an appearance of domestic quietness removed from the strife and uneasiness of the business world." French towns impressed Doyle mainly by their tight, filthy streets and small, unclean-looking houses, all "leaving an opinion that little attention is paid to the elegancies or even comforts of life." Samuel Cox likewise rhapsodized at the "ivy-covered cottages" in the countryside outside Liverpool, where "*Comfort* is impressed every where." These homes epitomized the systematic attention to order that, Catharine Beecher's bestselling book on home economics maintained, enabled humankind to rise above "the remnants of barbarism." Travelers took heart that these features bound Britain and the United States together into a common middle-class culture. Upon embarking from London for Antwerp in 1839, Catharine Sedgwick reflected that an American could not think of an English family in its domestic circle without "reverencing and loving them." Nor could an Anglo-American depart from "his ancestral home" without feeling pride in his or her historical tie to it, or without feeling "an extended sense of the obligations imposed by his derivation from the English stock."[50]

Americans discovered further evidence for Anglo-American comity when they came upon British travelers on the Continent or when they received hospitality from them in Britain. Sociability between Americans and Britons was significant not only because it gave the lie to Anglophobic caricatures of British animosity toward the United States (although it did) but also because of the kind of hospitality Americans received. In socializing with British women and men, middling Americans recognized themselves. Europeans had difficulty distinguishing between Britons and Americans, a failure that rankled both but testified to the linguistic and cultural similarities that separated them from the peoples of the Continent. J. Morrison Harris, a Marylander, had no luck convincing an Italian gardener's wife that he was not English but American. "She shook her head," Harris recalled, "& said she never heard of America, but that she had seen 'Inglesi'!"[51]

Britons and Americans seemed alike to each other, as well. At home, Americans were accustomed to emphasize the differences between themselves and Britain. Visiting the societies of the Continent allowed travelers to appreciate

that a common Victorian culture was beginning to bridge the Atlantic. The earnestly moral and modernizing features that Daniel Walker Howe has identified as the heart of this vision are readily visible in American travelers' accounts. Anne Bullard and her British companions noted that Genoese dockworkers, working without machinery, struggled to "accomplish what the ingenuity of an Englishman or an American would do with the utmost ease." Bullard, like other Americans, was glad to share carriages with British travelers and noted that Britons and Americans roomed at the same hotels. Their common language allowed them to converse, and their cultural similarities gave them much to talk about. Shared understandings about domesticity drew the two peoples together on the Continent. Mary Hering Middleton held small, intimate gatherings at her St. Petersburg residence in the 1820s as a respite from the exhausting round of posh state parties. She told her sister-in-law that "there is nothing like a little friendly party which can be found in Eng[land] & America" but was unknown in Russia and other parts of Europe.[52]

From their travels, Americans learned that they shared with Britons the same beliefs about domestic life. George Handel "Yankee" Hill, a famous New England actor, was anxious to have his Anglophobia confirmed when he visited England in 1836. Instead, he found hospitality, benign curiosity about the States, and a similar way of life. "I don't really feel that I am in a foreign land, nor am I," he concluded. Americans were surprised to learn that even the English sometimes had trouble identifying them. When Pliny Earle announced his nationality to an English friend's sister, she panicked—discovering him to be an American, not a fellow Briton, she assumed that he would spit tobacco juice all over her house. But Earle, like other travelers, was warmly welcomed by his hosts, one of whom warned him fraternally of the dangers Paris posed to Englishmen and Americans. Mary Grosvenor Bangs's party was a little dispirited by the ignorance their English hosts exhibited toward the United States—one thought they were too white to be Americans, and another placed her native Massachusetts in the far west—but their hospitality more than made up for their lack of knowledge. "I shall no longer look upon the English as cold and proud," she declared. William Augustus Williams, a Wilmington, North Carolina, merchant, made a similar discovery when he visited Scotland in 1833. "Never was I more hospitably treated or so kindly received," he wrote. "I found a warmhearted people & free from deceit & universally republican principles."[53]

Travelers keen to understand what Emma Willard called the "the general interiour of things"—the private, domestic lives of European peoples—ranked

one subject above all others: the status of women. It was crucial that women occupy a place commensurate with their all-important role as the moral guardians of the nation. "There is a beautiful *parallelism*," the editors of *Godey's Lady's Book* declared, "between the condition of woman in her domestic life, and the character of a nation." Americans largely agreed that Europeans failed to appreciate the domestic, family-oriented nature of women. Only in the United States did women enjoy the influence to which their enhanced moral sensibilities and motherly instincts entitled them. Even England, so like the United States in most areas dear to middle-class Americans, lagged behind in this regard. Although Henry Colman observed that Queen Victoria's "domestic character is exemplary and beautiful," little else about British women's lives pleased him. He argued that the British were much in advance of Americans in luxury and high culture, but he believed that most women in Britain were like the field workers he met in Scotland—coarse and vulgar in manners, "sallow, haggard, bare-footed, ragged, and dirty" in appearance. Julia Haylander of Philadelphia was also upset by the condition of English women, epitomized for her by two young girls performing with a London street musician in 1833. Astonished by this "prostitution of female delicacy," Haylander shuddered when she considered what would happen to the girls as they grew up. Even Emma Willard, otherwise an admirer of things British, declared that, as a woman, she could not abide residence in Britain. Considering women's condition "the main test of civilization," Willard faulted England for its lack of educational opportunities and for the subservience of women to men. In the United States, she was tempted to say to an English dinner companion, "The lower classes of women did not call their husbands 'master,' as is the case here."[54]

Not surprisingly, travelers found conditions for women far worse on the Continent. The more limited penetration of middle-class culture, Americans believed, reduced women to ornaments or drudges, depending on their social station. An episode on an Austrian railway illustrated for Frederick Gale how societies based on rank failed to respect women's dignity. Not only did an aristocratic officer take up an entire bench with his luggage, but he refused to move his bags to accommodate a peasant girl. He even grew indignant when Gale suggested he do so. Paris, the center of fashionable life, presented women with a different dilemma. According to Emma Willard's indictment, its brilliant society rewarded ornamental accomplishments—wit, dance, and gossip—instead of the practical, moral, and academic acquirements that rendered women a healthy influence on the nation. Willard illustrated the moral dangers of Paris

by describing an American lady who had been irreparably damaged by her long residence. Willard could "read no thought or feeling of genuine benevolence in any line of her face, or accent of her voice; but cold self-interest instead."[55]

Southern Europe, travelers argued, inverted France's vices. Here it was not gentility, but its absence, that degraded women. When young men at a Milan opera openly ogled Catharine Sedgwick's party, she concluded that sexual objectification limited women's influence. Sedgwick thought that the contrast between Italian men's "abashing effrontery" and the respect women received in the United States was a telling sign of the degraded state of women in Italy relative to the United States. These sentiments were widely shared among American travelers. Kate Jones, from Columbus, Georgia, agreed with an English companion's judgment that Italian men saw women as either "a toy or a drudge." As a result, its society lacked the foundation for sound morality, the element that had "made our country what it is—The *wives, Mothers, and daughters*!"[56]

One feature of continental life illustrated differences in American and European gender conventions most vividly: women's farm labor. Not all travelers had access to European households, but they all, in the process of traveling from place to place, could examine agricultural practices. Americans—women and men, northerners, westerners, and southerners—expressed shock at the heavy physical labor relegated to women on European farms. The sight of a barefooted Irish peasant woman walking alongside her well-shod "lazy lord and master" infuriated Frederick Gale in 1847. He fully endorsed the judgment of his Prussian companion that this represented a "violation of common decency & chivalrous regard for the sex." Americans expected to see women engaged in farm labor. What surprised them was that women seemed assigned to the hardest, most physically taxing tasks. Martha Amory noted that her partiality for American ways did not prepare her to see women managing horses in farms outside Marseilles in 1833. "In fact," she recorded in her diary, "almost all kinds of manual labour seem their province." To middle-class American sensibilities, this division of labor epitomized retrograde inequalities endemic to the Old World. Ditch digging, manure shoveling, and heavy lifting degraded women. It removed them from the uplifting domestic duties to which they were uniquely suited. Noting how women outside Baden-Baden did hard labor fully exposed to the elements, Kate Jones sighed, "They are perfect beasts of burden."[57]

A middle-class perspective tended to draw attention to the differences between the United States and Europe. Although in many respects Britain and the United States seemed to be part of the same moral universe, in other ways—women's status in particular—they seemed to diverge sharply. A significant

minority of American travelers dissented from this consensus, however. These dissenters maintained that middle-class culture was making inroads throughout the Old World. They also charged Americans with hubris or ignorance in their smug appraisals of European backwardness. Henry Middleton excoriated his compatriots for judging France when few of them spoke the language or had any access to its private society. Americans understood Parisians as well "as if they had been the inhabitants of some distant planet," he told his sister Eliza. Middleton's access to polite society did not dispose him to admire French manners and morals, but others were more sympathetic. While studying medicine in Paris in 1823, Rodman Paul had many opportunities to dine with the families of his fellow students. While he admitted that French manners "in many cases are very different from those in America," he had a warm relationship with the family at whose home he boarded. Likewise Catherine Wheaton, daughter of the American minister to Prussia, thought that respectable European women were much like Americans of similar station. Her father's position afforded her many opportunities for meeting women from across the Continent. She concluded that, much like Americans, "European women without *meddling* in politics understand very generally what is going on in the world."[58]

Other travelers disagreed with the conventional, bleak appraisal of continental manners or insisted that Europeans were on the path to moral improvement. James E. Cabot looked back on his 1840–41 residence in Paris as a wasted opportunity because his overprotective brother was "more impressed by the *danger* of Paris" than he should have been. Not only were American assumptions about Parisian immorality wrong, Cabot argued, but they prevented travelers from appreciating the city on its own terms. Other travelers pointed to the family lives of Lafayette and Louis Philippe, the "Citizen King," to show Americans that the French people were capable of middle-class domesticity. James Minor Glassell of Virginia drew a charming picture of Lafayette's family at La Grange, his estate outside Paris. His granddaughters epitomized wholesome womanhood, dressing tastefully but simply while bounding through the grounds "with as much activity as any of our Mountain girls could have done." They also mastered domestic gentility, entertaining the guests after dinner with music and conversation. Lafayette's granddaughter Mathilde favorably impressed Emma Willard, who found her manners to be "without coquetry, or prudery, or affectation. Her face seemed less formed for brilliancy, than for the expression of sensibility." Willard was doubly surprised to find these same qualities in the queen, since they confounded her assumptions about royalty as well as France. She was known to be a "pious, virtuous, charitable and amiable person; a frequenter of

the church, a good wife, —a setter of good examples to her daughters; —and to her country-women; —too many of whom need them." These appraisals made the case that middle-class domesticity had established a foundation in France.[59]

Americans were clearly conflicted over their relationship with France. Old prejudices, reinforced by images associated with the Revolution, created powerful negative associations. Yet Americans regarded France as the highest state of Western civilization. France was distinctive, even dangerously so, but still part of Americans' cultural universe. Travelers were less sanguine about Italy and Spain, but some of them did insist that their peoples had not been ruined by poverty, despotism, and the Catholic Church. Robert Turnbull likened virtuous people in Naples to vegetation on Mount Vesuvius—their very presence was cause for optimism. "Everywhere, under Christian influences, more or less perfect, God has his chosen ones; and everywhere, therefore, *we* ought to cherish a spirit of charity and hope." The glory of classical antiquity gave Americans reasons to be optimistic about Italy's future. Once the home of a great and virtuous people, Italy might rise again. Writing in the *North American Review*, George Washington Greene chided critics of Italy for writing it off. Modern Italy had progressed in many ways and would continue to do so. The key, Greene maintained, was in Italians' adoption of middle-class attitudes toward women and the family. "They are more domestic in their habits and feelings," he insisted. Greene asked, "When we consider what female influence is, how large a portion of almost every man's life is passed in the presence of mothers and sisters and wives, may we not count this, too, among the hopes of Italy?" His was a minority opinion. Few American travelers saw much evidence of middle-class family life in Italy. However, the dissenters were important. They provided reasons for Americans to hope that the Revolutions of 1848 throughout the peninsula might have a social foundation. They also gave ammunition to critics anxious to counter a new and more insidious view of Italians and other non-Anglo-Saxon peoples: that their differences stemmed from racial inferiority, not historical and environmental circumstances.[60]

Europe puzzled Americans who assumed that middle-class family habits were or should be universal. Americans never considered understanding Europe on its own terms, as a place different from theirs with its own cultural traditions that ought to command their respect. They could not observe without judging, and Americans were judges with an unusual degree of self-regard. In some respects American-style domesticity could be found in western Europe, especially Britain. But, for the most part, Europe disappointed Americans looking into the private, interior lives of its peoples. They seemed stuck in time, stub-

bornly resistant to the progressive currents of the nineteenth century. The fragmentary evidence some travelers found for middle-class culture offered limited grounds for optimism. At the very least, travelers took comfort that the domestic habits of European peoples did not amount to a threat to the United States, where middle-class ways were deeply entrenched. With two other aspects of Old World culture—gentility and the Catholic Church—the danger seemed far more real.

Gentility Troubles—Private and Public

Monarchs and aristocrats continued to confound Americans in the Jacksonian era. Old fears that aristocracy might poison republicanism no longer seemed credible, especially as American democracy entered an exceptionally vigorous phase in the 1830s. Rather, travelers worried about whether European gentility could be accommodated to the demands of middle-class democracy. As the middle class emerged in the late eighteenth century, women and men laid claim to manners and household goods that signified their ascendancy above the lower rungs of society. Lacking formal titles and a legal apparatus that divided people into clear hierarchies, Americans fell back on markers such as dress, education, manners, and consumption to lay claim to respectable status. Gentility was more than a blunt instrument of class differentiation. It was part of the middle-class ethos of improvement: just as Americans tried to make their world safer, more humane, and less sinful, they sought to enhance its beauty, civility, and taste.[61]

Because these commodities were available in the marketplace—even manners could be acquired through etiquette books—the spread of genteel culture did not clarify class lines. It blurred them. In Europe, the source of refined culture, travelers sought ways to solve this dilemma. They tried to find a way to reconcile an aristocratic ethic with republican equality. Travelers had the most success in the area of manners. Few Americans were under any illusions about the level of refinement in the United States, so they felt little reservation in admitting that they had much to learn from Europe. Travelers were far less certain how they should behave toward aristocrats and royalty. Their ambivalence stemmed not from fear—nobody any longer expected the United States to devolve into an aristocracy—but from nationalism. What was the proper orientation of patriotic Americans toward the symbols of elitism and oppression? More ominously, travelers divided over how to assess the apparatus of authority that upheld systems of rank in the Old World, such as armies, police forces, and border guards. Some travelers condemned them unequivocally, but others were

less certain. They wondered whether the boisterous, sometimes frightening democracy in the United States might benefit from some European-style social control.

Respectable people expected the United States to become more refined over time, but they understood that Europe was the center of genteel culture. America was the student; Europe, the teacher. Travelers were pleasantly surprised, therefore, to encounter refinement and comfort where they least expected it: on the transatlantic crossing. In large part, travelers' discovery of shipboard refinement was a function of their low expectations. Transatlantic passengers before the grand age of steam looked forward to the ocean journey as an ordeal to be endured, not enjoyed. They anticipated bad food, seasickness, boredom, and a drunken, profane crew. Even with these low standards, the level of civilization amidships still disappointed some travelers. Julia Haylander could not look past the knowledge that one of the passengers on her return voyage was the captain's mistress. "This woman of suspicious character destroys all comfort," she told her diary. The uncompromising Congregational minister Henry T. Cheever, sailing to Spain on the ship *Empress* in 1833, could not ignore the many failings of the vessel's captain. He "makes use of profane and vulgar language," Cheever complained, "and his deportment & conversation at the table is far from being Christian or polite." For passengers who expected to find a high degree of refinement, the Atlantic crossing could be a long, unpleasant journey.[62]

Because cultivation on the ocean passage could not be expected, travelers opted to create it for themselves. Given that shipboard luxuries were at the mercy of the elements and that passengers were, quite literally, confined with one another for several weeks, most women and men tried to enjoy whatever refinements the journey offered. Charlotte Brinckerhoff Bronson, sailing on the packet ship *Poland* in 1838, praised the comfortable sofas in the ladies' cabin even while she recorded how high seas caused dishes to dance "a regular jig" one morning. Later that day when a wave soaked the male passengers, she and the other women "joined in a chorus of immoderate laughter." Refined travelers confronted the inevitable discomforts of an ocean crossing with good humor. The sailing packets of the Jacksonian era strove to make the passage a luxurious experience. Orville Dewey characterized the *George Washington* as a "floating palace" where passengers spent every day as if they were "a large party on a visit in the country." Eventually, steamships introduced unprecedented levels of luxury to transatlantic travel. Yet at first their only advantages were speed; they were far less comfortable than sailing vessels. An experienced traveler responded to the hype surrounding the 1838 maiden voyage of the *Great Western* by pointing out that

"one can be far more comfortably situated on board a packet ship than a steam vessel." The noise, stench, and smoke—besides anxiety that the engine might blow up at any moment—made refined travel difficult in the early years of steam. Still, the cachet of modernity made steam travel fashionable, whatever its drawbacks. James Freeman Clarke, who preferred sail's comfort, nevertheless admitted that "in a steamship are combined the highest results of modern science, and the last achievements of modern art . . . she is at the same time a ship, a machine, and a hotel."[63]

Once again on solid ground, travelers had to confront a tension at the heart of gentility. Could an aristocratic ethic be squared with republicanism? Gentility was expensive, impractical, concerned with appearances, and morally neutral, at best. These qualities made refinement difficult to reconcile with middle-class values. France, where refinement reached its zenith, epitomized travelers' dilemma. Emma Willard observed that Parisian women and men understood the essence of true gentility. They "live not for themselves, but for others." Yet French manners also exhibited the dark side of refinement: impiety, an emphasis on display over substance, obsession with rank, and insincerity. Parisians, said Henry Middleton, were a "very civil, well bred, and plausible set of people, and in the arts of lying, cheating, and deceiving have probably no rivals in the civilized world." Some travelers, unable to resolve these contradictions, lashed out. Elizabeth Walsh told a Philadelphia friend in 1837, "I hate France & the French more cordially than a Christian woman ought to do."[64]

That flat-out rejection of continental gentility was uncommon. Tourists balanced wariness toward the snares of Europe with an awareness of America's relative lack of sophistication. Emma Willard learned how to participate in Paris's polite society without compromising her strict middle-class principles. In fact, exposure to Europe forced more open-minded travelers to reconsider their views of anti-American travel writings like Frances Trollope's *Domestic Manners of the Americans*. Trollope's book and others like it stoked American nationalism by portraying the United States as a nation of vulgarians. Looking back across the Atlantic from Europe, many travelers were forced to admit that authors like Mrs. Trollope had a point. A writer in the *New York Mirror* observed that a visit to Europe prompted him or her to think of Fanny Butler's 1835 account of her first visit to the United States less defensively, and with "more philosophical indulgence," than heretofore. Even Thomas G. Cary, a staunch nationalist, said he would forgive Charles Dickens and Frederick Marryat for their unfair characterizations of the United States if their books helped wean American men off of their disgusting habit of spitting tobacco juice.[65]

Americans understood that their country could not match Europe's level of civilization, but they were confident that the United States could begin to catch up. It was essential that they do so, because refined manners would bind Americans more closely to the civilized world. They were a force for international understanding, a foundation for progress. Upon meeting a Frenchman in Switzerland, James Freeman Clarke observed that gentility was a standard of behavior that transcended political boundaries. It broke down national prejudices. His new companion "had nothing specially French about him. He resembled in all respects a highly cultivated Englishman or American." Travelers without the requisite contacts and manners could only look upon the polite world with confusion, envy, and resentment. Henry T. Cheever added a degree of self-loathing to that mix. Because he considered dancing to be sinful, Cheever fit in awkwardly with the English-speaking society in Malaga, Spain. Dancing was "deemed a necessary requisite for a gentleman" by the Anglo-American community there. Cheever sorely wished to socialize with the British consul's family and to make the acquaintance of the "Senoritas of Andalusia," but his ignorance of the genteel arts kept him isolated. By contrast, travelers who had mastered polite etiquette entered society quite confidently, assuming they had opportunities to do so. Stephen Salisbury's upbringing enabled him to enjoy a mixed French, American, and British society in Paris, where he reveled in the "the gaiety of the people, and the general civility of their manners."[66]

Americans understood that their new civilization, its republican character, and their relative underdevelopment made the United States less refined than western Europe. Some of them openly idolized the Old World as the epitome of good taste. A friend of Harriet Colles sent a long list of items she wanted purchased for her, explaining, "We on this side feel as if everything was so much handsomer, and better, and desirable that comes from Paris." Travelers usually took an anthropological view of transatlantic manners, one that encouraged Americans to learn from Europeans' example. Henry Colman observed that English gentlewomen hiked up their skirts a little in order to keep them above the mud. Americans would not lest they violate feminine modesty. Insecure about their civilization, they sacrificed common sense at the altar of gentility. Colman urged his compatriots to learn from their English cousins and make manners "less of a study." Likewise, Virginian John Doyle thought that Americans could improve the tenor of their polite society by studying the Dublin gentry. There, married and single people mixed in society, a great advantage to young women ready to set off on "that hazardous voyage 'fashionable life.' " Americans threw

girls "into the vortex of dissipation" at so young an age that they did not develop the comportment so essential to women in either the drawing room or the household. National pride must not prevent Americans from admitting that, at least where refinement was concerned, Europe had much to teach them.[67]

Comfortable admitting their deficiencies in taste and manners, Americans were far less at ease with how to deal with the personifications of gentility—royalty and aristocrats. Although travelers' responses to august personages ran the gamut from rudeness to obsequiousness, acute self-consciousness was the common thread. Why were travelers, so willing to admit their country's gentility deficit, so insecure with the wellborn? Americans had not resolved the tension between the allure of aristocracy and their republican principles. William Gienapp observed that Americans "nurtured a deep-seated hatred of anything that smacked of aristocracy." They were staunchly, even unthinkingly, republican. And yet they could not shake off the sense that the ultimate source of cultural and political legitimacy was a noble bloodline. "Only through aristocratic validation could the middle class fulfill its dreams," argues Richard Bushman. This unresolved struggle for legitimacy between aristocracy and republicanism explains travelers' conflicted, contradictory responses to the privileged orders.[68]

On the one extreme, Americans fawned before the great. Because this behavior was so obviously un-American, very few travelers admitted to it. In a private letter in 1829 James Brown, the U.S. minister to Paris, hinted at his wife Susan's aristocratic tastes. Having recently recovered from a long illness, she wasted no time in visiting "the King, the duchess of Berry, and the Duke of Orleans besides having attended several large and brilliant parties." The hospitality of these exalted figures "has had the most happy effect on her," Brown reported. A private audience was the highest honor a royal personage could bestow on a traveler, and Americans pursued them aggressively. In 1842 the entire Colles family arranged through U.S. minister Lewis Cass for a formal reception with Louis Philippe. Having dressed in their custom-made court clothes, including dress swords for the men, the family assembled at Cass's home and proceeded to the palace. Augusta Colles could hardly contain her excitement. The preface to her detailed diary entry of the event announced, "Great matters on the carpet! Reception at court! Conversations with the king and all the royal family!!!" Americans were often underwhelmed by royals' appearance or personality when they saw them in person. The prestige of high rank, however, usually compelled them to overlook these flaws. Martha Amory stared down the royal families of France and Belgium when her carriage pulled alongside theirs one Paris

day in 1831. The princesses were unremarkable, and the queen of France was "as plain a person as I ever beheld." Nevertheless, Amory realized, royalty "has a multitude of charms" that rendered ordinary people extraordinary.[69]

At the other extreme, travelers affected disdain for the privileged orders. Clumsy and self-conscious, this orientation stemmed from Americans' immature sense of nationalism. Mary Telfair of Georgia was representative of these travelers. "The servile devotion to rank in the English character is disgusting," she wrote to her friend Mary Few. And, as if to contradict Martha Amory, she claimed that she was immune to royalty's charms. Though Victoria "*wears a crown*," Telfair wrote, the queen was really just "a coarse looking woman with rather a cold countenance." Telfair believed that in judging Britain in this way she was simply doing her patriotic duty as an American. "I view with a *Republican* eye," she explained after visiting Blenheim. "I would rather be Mary Few or Mary Telfair than the Duchess of Marlborough." Republican travelers expressed disgust with their compatriots who stood in awe of titled Europeans. "Conceited, proud, and silly" was how Josephine Eppes assessed an American who bragged about her friendships "with Lord This and Lady That" during an 1850 dinner party in London. Since the United States represented republican government and egalitarian social relations, the appropriate response to kings, aristocrats, and the like was contempt or, at the very least, refusal to conform to rituals of submission. William Terrell, a Georgian, encountered Pope Pius IX in 1850, jauntily tipped his hat, and gave him a salute. When his friends marveled that the Pope's guards had not "sabered" him for his insolence, Terrell bragged that there was "nothing cringing, nothing of fear, nothing abject in my salutation."[70]

Cosmopolitan Americans had absolutely no sympathy with this kind of behavior, which was in its own way every bit as objectionable as servility. Writing in the *American Quarterly Review,* Robert Walsh admonished travelers against "high republican airs and unaccommodating manners" while visiting European countries. "False pretensions as republicans," Walsh reminded Americans, violated basic rules of civility. It was not obsequious to conform to the customs of the country, whether wearing court dress or using proper titles. It was merely polite. But most travelers were neither sycophantic nor rude. They were merely discomfited by rank and privilege. These visitors compensated by treating dukes, earls, and the like as living tourist attractions. They were interesting precisely in the same manner as Westminster Abbey or the Uffizi Gallery. Emma Willard, fearing that she was writing too much about Lafayette, promised a correspondent she would indulge her "republican curiosity" by telling her about the royal family—a "commodity," as she called them, that Americans did not possess at

home. Kate Jones echoed Willard when an Englishman teased about her interest in catching a glimpse of the Tsar at the Crystal Palace exhibition. It did not make her any less a republican, she answered. It was simply that her "object was *sight seeing*," and she "wanted to view all the curiosities."[71]

There was something too casual in Willard's and Jones's dismissal of royals as mere tourist attractions. It, too, was an affectation, a denial that there was anything extraordinary about the privileged orders. A final group of travelers recognized their special status but tried to reconcile royalty to American values by republicanizing it. This was easier with some figures than others. The Tsar of Russia could not be turned into a republican. But Britain's constitution and France's July Monarchy did offer travelers materials to work with. Soon after the July Revolution, a friend told Stephen Salisbury that the new queen had asked to meet the American women currently in Paris. A few days later, he noted approvingly, they were presented "with as little ceremony as would have been experienced at a private dwelling." Isaac Appleton Jewett and Henry Colman also praised Louis Philippe for his aversion to ceremony. Not only did the Citizen King speak fluent English, but he did not require his guests to kneel—unlike Queen Victoria, Colman pointed out. Most Americans were more charitable than Colman to the British royal family, who seemed so eminently respectable in their private habits. Victoria and Albert were less regal than Americans expected kings and queens to be, but that made them more accessible—and acceptable. Seeing Prince Albert in his coach at St. James Park in 1849, Daniel Aiken observed that his bearing was "that of a well-bred gentleman," not a haughty monarch. The paradox that Colman, Aiken, and others like them contrived—republican monarchies—came closest to satisfying Americans' unresolved feelings toward aristocracy. Fascinated in spite of themselves, travelers tamed lords, ladies, and kings by pretending that they could be reconciled with republicanism.[72]

Travelers, as we have seen, did not always republicanize monarchs and aristocrats. Some of them were unabashed admirers. These people brought down upon themselves the scorn of their fellow Americans, but not because (as in the recent past) the republic's fragility demanded that aristocracy be flatly condemned. Flattering the great was simply embarrassing and un-American. The exercise of despotic government power was another matter entirely. The United States was anything but orderly in the decades before the Civil War. Crowds mobbed antislavery activists, nativist gangs shot it out with immigrants, upright citizens lynched gamblers and drunkards, and street battles raged on the streets of New York over Shakespearian theater. Conservatives objected to the

ordinary practices of antebellum politics, which included high levels of participation, low levels of deference, and large, rowdy parades, meetings, and other rituals. Might Europe show Americans some ways to control its dangerous classes—by force, if necessary?[73]

The conventional, patriotic answer was "no," and most travelers said so. Americans frequently commented on the presence of police and uniformed men on the streets of European cities. Parisians lived under "the constant watch of a military force," noted Emma Willard. They were everywhere, looking for the slightest sign of unrest. A traveler could not go into any public place without seeing armed men on horseback on patrol. Caroline Kirkland thought that Americans would encounter nothing in London more startling than the "policemen that start up at every corner, at every gate, in every concourse, before every public place." Kirkland complimented the London force for its civility and professionalism. They were of great assistance to her, a stranger in a huge, confusing city. Yet she was deeply troubled about the implications for British society. "One cannot help asking, what kind of people must they be, who require an army to keep them in order?" Large police forces and peacetime armies patrolling European streets reinforced exceptionalist conceits, but they also stirred international feelings. It was not as an American, but as a "transatlantic republican," that Samuel Cox grew hot at the sight of "military locusts" keeping Paris secure for Louis Napoleon. Why were the troops necessary? Because, Cox answered, "France has had a taste of republicanism."[74]

Others were not so quick to condemn the heavy hand of European police forces. No one recommended that an army patrol the streets of New York or Philadelphia, but a broad cross section of travelers concluded that Americans paid a heavy price for failing to enforce law and order aggressively. To George Endicott, a New York printer, Paris seemed like the "best regulated city imaginable, no drunkenness, no rows, no alarms of fires—no Irishmen, no negroes, no dirty streets, no pickpockets or vagabonds." The reason was simple: "the most *rigid police*. You can scarcely step, or turn, but an *armed man* stares you in the face." The public order of German cities was a main theme of John H. Martinstein's letters. Behaviors that in an American city would be taken for granted—walking on the grass in parks, picking flowers in public gardens, horseracing in the streets, public drunkenness—were "strictly forbidden by the police" in Germany. What these travelers implied, others expressed clearly: the cost of America's commitment to individualism was too high. The good order of European cities demonstrated the merits of strong police authority.[75]

These measures would benefit women most of all. Unlike in the States, declared Abigail de Hart Mayo, French women were not leered at, insulted, or propositioned in public places. "So many gendarmes are always on hand to keep order that a well-behaved woman is sure of a protector at every turn." One morning at the Tuileries Palace she watched approvingly as the police beat up "a dirty-looking fellow" who tried to elbow past women in a line. Henry Colman pointed out that not just women but all law-abiding Americans would profit from European-style policing. Both good order and sound morality would result. The police kept prostitutes off the streets of Paris after 11:00 p.m. Only women who could give a satisfactory explanation for being out in public past that hour escaped harassment. "This is the effect of a strict and numerous police," Colman told his readers. And who needed to fear the police, except criminals? Colman drew the obvious—and, to Americans, shocking—conclusion: "Well, then, I am content to have a strict police. If the vicious cannot be controlled, so that the well disposed and virtuous may be secure without bayonets, I am content to have bayonets."[76]

Colman's views were certainly extreme, but they were consistent with those of other travelers who saw merit in European systems of public order. Of those parts of the apparatus of formal and informal social control that travelers came across in Europe—class structures, gentility, and policing—it posed the greatest potential to distort American national character. In the years after the Revolution, an infatuation with aristocrats threatened to influence the trajectory of American culture. By the Jacksonian period, aristocratic envy was no more than a harmless, if embarrassing, affectation. Americans were already embracing gentility and seemed confident that it could be reconciled with middle-class morals. Authority was another matter. Could free government and individual liberties be reconciled with the enforcement of public order by strong police forces? Some travelers thought they could.[77]

Catholic Envy in a Nativist Age

Anti-Catholicism was the single most consistent characteristic exhibited by American travelers in Europe from 1750 through 1861. Americans disagreed over how they should behave toward aristocrats, whether free government would ever thrive in Italy, if poverty was endemic to the Old World, and practically every other issue—except one. They united in their disdain for the Catholic Church. However, as we have seen, the postrevolutionary decades saw a relative

decline in anti-Catholic sentiment among travelers. With little Catholic immigration to the United States, Rome's threat to the republic seemed more theoretical than real. Travelers dedicated themselves to appreciating Catholic art, not warning their compatriots about the papist contagion. That orientation changed in the antebellum decades, when a surge of Catholic immigrants, chiefly Irish and German, entered the United States. Intellectuals and religious figures warned Americans that the new immigrants were the opening wedge of a plot to subjugate the United States under the papist yoke. Popular anti-Catholicism surged as well, fed by lurid accounts such as Maria Monk's *Awful Disclosures of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal* (1836).[78]

Americans abroad in the mid-nineteenth century examined the myriad aspects of the Catholic threat. Catholic churches, art, and even religious services had long been a part of tourists' sightseeing itineraries, but now their study became a patriotic duty. Travelers dissected the church's many failings. Though sensitive to Catholicism's doctrinal errors, they were chiefly interested in how the church harmed society by discouraging intellectual development, economic activity, sound morals, and individual freedom. At the same time, travelers continued to link the United States historically, and even religiously, to the Roman Catholic Church. Travelers refused to condemn sacred art and architecture. To the contrary, the tradition of "Catholic envy" intensified in this period. Americans were anxious to insulate themselves from present-day Catholics, but they would neither disassociate themselves from religiously inspired high culture nor deny any value to Catholic piety. These refusals enraged the small cohort of Americans who saw Rome as an existential threat to republicanism. These travelers—chiefly New England ministers from Congregationalist backgrounds—urged Americans to reject all connection with the Catholic Church and to take strong countermeasures against it. They had very limited success in carrying this argument, perhaps because their fellow European travelers saw no merit in it. In essence, travelers were engaged in a debate about the nation's relationship, historically and in real time, with the Catholic Church.[79]

Antebellum travelers did not depart significantly from established anti-Catholic tropes. Two features were new: a heightened sense of alarm among travelers generally, and the presence of ardent anti-Catholics who saw Rome as a dire, immediate threat to American civilization. Immigration compelled travelers to amplify criticisms that were already well established in the eighteenth century. Southern Europe—Spain and Italy—continued to stir the most potent anti-Catholic sentiments. There, travelers confronted an energetic Church whose influence seemed to poison public life, the family, and the economy.

Irish and French Catholicism appeared feeble by comparison. The weakness of the latter was particularly striking. En route to Rennes in the summer of 1844, the young Philadelphian J. Peter Lesley was shocked by his driver's profession of irreligion. He "pointed to the horses—& said his religion was like theirs," Lesley reported. While hardly admirable, this kind of impiety posed no threat to the United States. An active, energetic Church did. Of course, Catholicism seemed, in its own way, irreligious. Its splendor and mysteries—especially the Latin mass—struck Protestants as little better than paganism. Elliott Cresson insisted that Catholics' "adoration of saints, images, pictures, 'sticks & stones' is as direct & positive as under any pagan creed." Most Americans simply dismissed Church practices as diverting, but ultimately empty, spectacles—"pomp and nonsense," as Isabella Faber called them.[80]

If Catholic pageantry simply lulled individuals into error, it might be ignored. Travelers wanted to show how the church laid waste to entire nations. The Reverend Orville Dewey employed a common device—the border crossing—to illustrate how it blighted whole regions. The traveler who crossed the border into the Papal States could instantly identify "the places that belong to the patrimony of the church, by their utter misery." The magnificence of sacred architecture and the beauty of Catholic art made poverty both more obvious and harder to excuse. The juxtaposition between splendor and poverty was itself an indictment of the church's moral authority. John A. Clark noted, "Every where in papal countries, while a few are elevated to great eminence and splendour, we see the mass of the people in poverty and wretchedness." Fervent anti-Catholics hoped the lesson was clear: massive Catholic immigration put American equality and prosperity at risk.[81]

Catholicism also endangered American morals, an important consideration for middle-class folks who ranked God's law above mammon. Travelers' observations intersected with the wildly popular genre of convent exposés, which portrayed nunneries as centers of sexual exploitation and infanticide. The "crime and degradation, and almost utter absence of everything like virtue and religion," made Kate Jones wish she could wall off modern Rome from the classical city during her 1851 visit. The conventions of both private and public writing prevented authors from writing candidly about sexual transgressions, but Jones's emotive language is highly suggestive. Elliott Cresson did feel free to be more explicit in his 1825–26 diary. Since saints were little more than "fornicating rogues," Cresson announced, it was little surprise that priests felt entitled to gratify their "unhallowed passions . . . by any means however diabolical." He believed that priests exploited their confessors' duties to seduce nuns and used

their political influence to have women's lovers and husbands drafted into the Pope's armies. The implications for American society were obvious. A faith that not only tolerated but encouraged assaults on female modesty had no place in the middle-class republic.[82]

Catholicism was also un-American because it stood opposed to freedom. Travelers argued that the church's authority rested on ignorance and coercion. It could not survive open inquiry, religious choice, or political liberty. When a shoemaker's servant in Prague kissed the hand of an American customer, Frederick Gale saw this as evidence that the "full obsequiousness of the lower class" was only to be found in Catholic nations. Americans believed that Protestantism, investing each individual believer with the responsibility for his or her own salvation, promoted equality and human dignity. Catholicism encouraged ignorance and superstition—the former by design, so believers would not question its authority, the latter by its arcane rituals. J. Peter Lesley characterized rural France, so different from cosmopolitan Paris, as "a land of darkness, where superstition reigns." Finally, Americans associated the church with tyranny. They had good reasons for doing so, as the church was a staunch opponent of liberal movements throughout the nineteenth century. Pius IX, initially seen as a progressive reformer, authored the definitive repudiation of liberalism, the encyclical *Quanta Cura* (1864), with its infamous "Syllabus of Errors." In Spain during the First Carlist War (1833–39), which pitted liberals against absolutists, Henry Cheever explained that the church's despotic nature compelled it to oppose movements for freedom of any kind. "Popery must always go with monarchy & despotism," he insisted. "There was no neutral ground . . . its principles were at war with republicanism & it must always be itself overthrown or rise upon the ruins of liberal institutions."[83]

These were not the views of a small minority of bigots. Protestant Americans agreed that Catholic worship was mostly spectacle, that the church promoted immorality and poverty, and that it was politically reactionary. Most travelers went no further than to make these observations, which confirmed what most of their compatriots already believed. A few, however, took the next step. They admonished Americans to abandon their complacency in the face of the Catholic threat. The church was no longer a curiosity confined to the Old World. The "far-spreading catholic system," as Isaac Jewett called it, had crossed the Atlantic. Charles Rockwell published his travel account in part to counter "the singular ignorance and apathy which prevail in the United States, with regard to the essential and inherent superstition, bigotry, and idolatry of the Papal religion,

its hostility to general education, to freedom of thought and action, and to civil and religious liberty in every form." Henry Cheever agreed. Their tradition of religious toleration, together with the small number of Catholics in the population, led Americans to misunderstand the peril posed by the church. These travelers strained to prove that Catholicism was not just another Christian sect, but a malignant power. Cheever chose two metaphors to explain how Catholic priests would undermine republicanism. They were "rattlesnakes," injecting "poison through the body politic." They were also "sappers working under the orders of a foreign general, & if not prevented they would undermine the liberties of our republic."[84]

Cheever wrote about prevention. He and other zealous anti-Catholic travelers sought not merely to warn their compatriots of the danger they faced, but to recommend a course of action. Here, they stepped beyond conventional anti-Catholicism into more radical territory. Cherished liberties needed to be reassessed in light of the nature of Rome's threat. Long-accepted policies had to be reviewed and, perhaps, scrapped. George B. Cheever recommended that Americans tighten immigration laws and otherwise gird themselves for a long struggle with a domestic enemy. He noted that since 1800 immigration had swelled the Catholic population of Geneva. Should they become a majority, Cheever predicted that the Genevese would soon lose their political and religious freedoms. "The possibility of these things," he noted, "do[es] fill the minds of good men and lovers of their country with great alarm." The Genevese—and Americans—should fear the day "when Romanism should gain the ascendency in her councils." Charles Rockwell told Americans that Rome was ready to invade the United States with an army of missionaries. The church was marshaling its strength to attack the United States not with arms, but with its seductive, un-republican faith. Rockwell admonished Americans not only to be vigilant against missions that would spread "popular ignorance, and . . . civil and religious despotism," but to devote themselves to carrying the Protestant gospel into Catholic strongholds in both hemispheres—including Italy itself. The nativists of the antebellum era saw Catholicism as an alien and hostile tradition, the antithesis of middle-class, republican principles. It was a negative reference point, a symbol of all that the United States was not and never ought to become.[85]

Travelers resisted these calls to action. They did not believe that Catholicism posed a danger to fundamental American values. It did not require that Americans reassess their civil liberties or adopt aggressive countermeasures. Despite nativists' dire warnings, Americans continued to link themselves historically to

the Catholic Church. Moreover, they balanced widely held anti-Catholic prejudices against openness toward the value of Catholic religious practice. Confronted with Catholic art and piety, Protestant Americans often found their own religious traditions wanting. Of course, the United States had nothing to compare to Europe's great cathedrals, but even ordinary Catholic churches dwarfed most American buildings in scale and magnificence. Although unimpressed by the exterior of Rome's churches, Catharine Sedgwick thought that the interior of any Catholic house of worship made Protestant churches, including Westminster Cathedral, look like vacant buildings. Her correspondents who had attended spare "Puritan *meeting-house*[*s*]" their whole lives could have no conception of the majesty of a structure like the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, Sedgwick wrote. Americans were even more amazed that these churches could be found not only in Rome but throughout Europe. No American could visualize the splendor of Palermo's churches, a Massachusetts diarist wrote in 1844. "It seems to me that the humblest chapel I have visited, would attract thousands of visitors in America, and would be gazed upon with wonder."[86]

Travelers were moved by not only the magnificence of Catholic architecture but also the beauty of sacred music and even the rituals of the mass. Paris's Le Madeleine impressed Henry Colman with its magnificent interior and exterior, but what really awed him was Christmas mass, which "conspired to present a scene of most extraordinary and affecting magnificence, and a beauty which is perfectly indescribable." Although travelers conventionally contrasted the church's brilliance with the poverty endemic to much of Catholic Europe, very few did so while touring churches or attending mass. In these contexts travelers were too captivated by the authenticity of Catholic devotion to descend into conventional prejudices. Some even had the courage to admit Catholic superiority to American practice. Virginian Martha Custis preferred the "indiscriminate mingling of all the classes" in a Parisian church with American pew rental, whereby richer worshippers sat toward the front, because "in Heaven, surely it will be so—for there all distinctions will be annihilated."[87]

St. Peter's Basilica was the most awe-inspiring site of all. Instead of seeing its magnificence as a diversion from the believer's direct communion with God, the church impressed upon Protestant travelers the deepest feelings of religious reverence. Anne Bullard remarked, "I never appreciated and rejoiced in God's omniscience as here." St. Peter's was also the Catholic site to which Americans felt the most visceral historical connection. John Carter Brown had no sooner arranged housekeeping in Rome when he rushed out to see St. Peter's, "this

wonderful building [about which] I had heard & read so much." He was not disappointed: "such an impression it made upon my mind can never be lost." A quarter century later, Frederick Gale also felt an irresistible compulsion to see St. Peter's. Arriving late one night in Rome, he could not bear to lay down to sleep within a short walk of St. Peter's and not visit what had "been but a vision and a dream" his entire life. Like so many Americans, Gale had read descriptions of the majesty of St. Peter's and was certain they were too good to be true. But they were true. Gale wrote, "I was like the unbelieving Paul, converted swiftly and suddenly by a vision of heavenly glory." St. Peter's—the embodiment of papal authority—did not repel Protestant travelers, but made them feel a deep and profound connection to the Catholic Church. Travelers marveled at Catholic architecture for precisely the same reason they felt awe at seeing Mont Blanc or the Trossachs. Both elicited feelings of the sublime—of perceiving oneself as a small part of a much greater and epic whole. Cathedrals and the like stirred Americans' emotions exactly as natural wonders did, which is why nativists' warnings seldom disturbed their reveries. They were being touched on a deep emotional level that anti-Catholic ideologues could not penetrate.[88]

That failure frustrated and alarmed nativists. Wishing to effect the maximum separation between the United States and Catholic Europe, they explained that admiration for Catholic art and ritual was a character flaw, a sign of a weak mind—and a danger to the republic. Elliott Cresson remarked of Christmas mass at St. Peter's Basilica, "As a spectacle, I remember no one of equal brilliancy, but certainly had very little of Christianity to recommend it." These critics argued that Catholicism's appeal was just another manifestation of an antebellum culture noted for outlandish entertainments and bizarre fads. The mass had all the religious value as one of P. T. Barnum's exhibitions. Charles Rockwell maintained that Catholic grandeur only affected "ill-balanced minds, which are easily wrought upon by pomp and show, by noise and glare, and tinsel." It held no appeal at all for intellectually serious, genuinely devout people. J. Peter Lesley agreed, writing that while impious Americans were susceptible to being awed by cathedrals, "the true Christian cannot [be]." The difficulty was that many Americans who saw themselves as true Christians did see merit in Catholic practices. Rockwell conceded that "the peculiar and imposing dignity and grandeur" of Catholic art and ritual was a commonplace of travel literature. Middle-class Americans believed Protestantism to be integral to their national identity. They agreed that Catholicism encouraged habits of mind inconsistent with republicanism and middle-class respectability. However, they also saw their

nation as an extension of Europe, as a part of Western civilization. That civilization included Catholic Europe.[89]

Middle-class travelers established many connections between the United States and Europe. They found a mutual commitment to progress, the definitive source of gentility, and they even reaffirmed their historical links to Catholicism. If it appears that the travelers of this period emphasized the differences between the Old and New Worlds, it is because they made contrasts more starkly, and with less subtlety, than they made connections. The oppositions—poverty and prosperity, modernity and antiquity, respectability and aristocracy, Catholicism and Protestantism—are easier to discern than the more sophisticated, but equally important, links that travelers made. Additionally, in this era of rowdy nationalism some travel writers made pointed contrasts with an eye to establishing American superiority to the Old World. Many Americans—Henry Tuckerman, Margaret Fuller, Samuel Cox, and Henry Colman, to name a few—were sharply critical of this tradition. But none dissected middle-class prejudices more effectively than a well-traveled Worcester, Massachusetts, critic, George Jacques. Jacques was provoked to action by a series of brutally nationalistic travel letters published in the Worcester *Spy* in the mid-1850s. He argued that the author overstated Parisian impiety, exaggerated the degree of unfreedom throughout the Continent, misunderstood the status of women, harped incessantly on poverty but ignored economic development, and blamed everything wrong with Europe on the Catholic Church. And because, "next to the Englishman, the American is the most conceited of all travelers," the author had ignored equal, or worse, manifestations of these problems in the United States. In Jacques's opinion, French godlessness was preferable to New England piety, which consisted of "praying for your neighbors Sunday, and *preying on them*, week-days!" As for despotism and poverty, Europe had nothing so terrible as American slavery. Jacques charged that the author was equally myopic about the condition of women and the abuses of the Catholic Church.[90]

Jacques was right about the *Spy*'s letters, which epitomized middle-class self-regard vis-à-vis Europe—which he very effectively deflated. But Jacques was wrong to characterize these letters as representative of American opinion. In fact, their sharp differentiation between the United States and Europe distinguished them from the mass of travelers' writings. Americans abroad were no more narrow-minded and nationalist than European visitors to the United States. And, unlike Frances Trollope and Frederick Marryat, Americans were as eager to establish connections with Europe as they were to distinguish them-

selves from it. Most travelers fell in between the extremes of slavish imitation and smug rejection of the Old World. Isaac Jewett noted, "There is much of query among travelling Americans, as to what of Europe might profitably be conveyed across the Atlantic." He endorsed a middle course, in which a confident United States would learn from Europe while marking its own path. He would "see American heart and mind developed, not into European perfection, but into their own natural completeness." Travelers did not strike as independent a course as Jewett wished, but neither did they idolize "European perfection." Their nationalist and middle-class prejudices notwithstanding, Americans made an insistent, but discriminating, connection with nineteenth-century Europe.[91]

Americans were not focused exclusively on the interior worlds of Europeans in the 1840s and 1850s. These were decades of intellectual and political ferment on both sides of the Atlantic. The Revolutions of 1848 forced Americans to reassess their relationship with the Old World. As republicans tried, and failed, to come to power across the Continent, travelers led American efforts to define the limits of transatlantic republicanism. At home, tensions over the spread of slavery into newly acquired territories threatened to break apart the Union. Americans in Europe had made it a point to seek each other out to reaffirm, and even create, a national identity. Antagonism between the North and South strained that tradition. These were also important decades in the development of nationalism. Some theorists began to argue in favor of a race-based nationalism that defined national identity by membership in a biologically determined group whose traits derived from nature, not the environment or history. In the United States, a concept of Anglo-Saxon identity arose that redefined long-standing traditions of Anglophilia in racialist terms. Race-based concepts challenged travelers' efforts to forge strong American connection with the Continent. The presence of African American travelers—most of them fugitives from slavery or antislavery lecturers—complicated these efforts even further. As the United States hurtled through midcentury, political developments frustrated travelers' efforts to define the nation's place in the Atlantic community.

"The manifold advantages resulting from our glorious Union"

1840s–1861

Travelers were fascinated by the ways Europe did and did not seem to be joining them in embracing a middle-class culture. They also kept a close eye on political developments in the Old World. Since 1789, Americans had hoped that Europe would throw off secular and religious despotisms, adopt republican governments, and recognize the rights of ordinary people. Europeans, those who both supported and opposed those movements, often pointed out that slavery gave Americans a shaky moral foundation from which to lecture them about freedom. Plenty of Americans agreed, even if they ultimately came to dismiss those criticisms. They believed that reactionaries drew attention to slavery to deflect attention away from Europe's greater evils. The travel writer Bayard Taylor admitted that he felt "shame and mortification" when the subject of slavery came up abroad, but he insisted that the liberties enjoyed by its white majority placed the United States "far above any other nation on earth."[1] Taylor did not intend to stress the superiority of the United States by his remark. He wanted Europeans to see across the Atlantic an example of positive revolutionary change without being diverted by what he believed was the comparatively minor flaw of racial slavery. As we have seen, middling Americans looked for evidence that Europe and the United States were on the same cultural path. They had the same expectations for politics and government.

A number of developments challenged that expectation. The Revolutions of 1848, which raised hopes that republicanism might take root from Ireland to Hungary, ended in reaction and failure. Skeptics concluded that Europe was not, and might never be, ready for self-government. The United States really was unique. These critics found support in the development of racial sciences such as ethnology, which flowered in the middle of the nineteenth century. Ethnologists emphasized that biology, not history or climate, caused peoples to develop differently. Some went much further, arguing that European peoples

were in fact separate races and that national character was biological in nature. This was a profoundly provincial movement. It discouraged curiosity toward other peoples. Humanity could not be on the same progressive path because the very concept of humanity was an illusion. Racism also informed ideas about nationalism in the middle decades of the century. Nationalists celebrated the distinctive qualities that set peoples apart from each other, but racial science infused that inquiry with a xenophobic, parochial spirit. Travel became an exercise in emphasizing difference. Race thinking was not invariably nationalistic, however. Anglo-Saxonism, the idea that peoples of English and Germanic background shared a common racial foundation, flourished after 1850. Of course, celebrating the unity of the Anglo-Saxons entailed denigrating other peoples.

By and large travelers resisted these trends toward national and racial exceptionalism. They were interested in situating the United States within a larger European civilization, not setting it apart. Travelers were not uninfluenced by nationalist and racist ideas, but they rejected their most extreme implications. Visitors to Europe enthusiastically supported the Revolutions of 1848 as they occurred and resisted succumbing to cynicism when they failed to meet expectations. They embraced new thinking about nationalism and national identity. They even brought together hitherto disparate observations on European/American differences into a well-developed concept of American nationality. Whether articulated in the more traditional vocabulary of "Union" or the more modern language of nation, this was a patriotic, but not exceptionalist, concept. It placed the United States as a nation among nations, not above them.

Northerners and southerners both affirmed this unionist vision, even amidst a period of mounting sectional tension. But it was antislavery travelers, especially black abolitionists, who developed the most sophisticated interpretation of cosmopolitan nationalism. Travelers even resisted the parochial connotations of Anglo-Saxonism, which they understood primarily as a shared culture between Britons and Americans rather than an ethnic or racial community. Recognition of these similarities did not inhibit Americans from affirming bonds with other European peoples, however. Few travelers had any sympathy with racial concepts that tried to draw distinctions between Europeans. In fact, they used their own experiences abroad as a rebuke to race-based arguments that denigrated some continental peoples. In the midcentury western European world, a variety of cultural currents came together to emphasize distinctions between peoples, to draw lines where previous generations had seen connections. This movement was sharply contested on both sides of the Atlantic. On the American side, travelers helped lead that resistance.

Making Sense of 1848

In 1848 Europe entered the third year of an agricultural crisis, impoverishing farmers and saddling urban workers with unemployment and high food prices. Dissatisfaction and distress imperiled the system of states established at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. In February, the French National Guard refused orders to fire on a Parisian crowd protesting the efforts of François Guizot, chief minister to King Louis Philippe, to censor his critics by suppressing public assemblies. Guizot resigned, but Parisians erected barricades after soldiers fired into a crowd, killing over fifty people. Louis Philippe abdicated and fled to England. When word reached Vienna of events in Paris, reformers demanded the resignation of Metternich, the installation of more liberal ministers, and other progressive changes. The unrest quickly spread to the empire's provinces, where subject peoples demanded autonomy if not outright independence. In Hungary, a Magyar revolt led by Lajos Kossuth fought to secure independence from Vienna. Cities in northern Italy rose in revolt. Czech nationalists seized Prague when reforms were not forthcoming. Romans drove the supposedly reformist Pope Pius IX out of the city following the assassination of his chief minister. In Prussia, Frederick William was pressured to promise a constitution and the establishment of a more liberal ministry after unrest in Berlin threatened to break out into a more general revolt.[2]

The year 1848 was not the first time that Americans had received promising news of unrest in the Atlantic World. France had erupted in revolution in 1789 and 1830. The massive slave rebellion in the New World's richest colony, Saint Domingue, simultaneously transfixed and horrified Americans in the 1790s. Napoleon Bonaparte's installation of his brother Joseph as king of Spain in 1808 set off independence movements throughout Spanish America. Greeks began a long, bloody revolt against the Ottoman Empire in 1821. Poland tried to throw off Russian rule in 1830. With the telling exception of Haiti (as Saint Domingue was renamed in 1804), Americans generally supported these revolutionary movements.[3] In the Greek and Latin American cases, there were even calls for intervention in support of the revolutionaries. In every case, support for independence movements was tempered by wariness. And, as many of these revolutions failed or evolved into long, disruptive conflicts, American opinion grew more ambivalent. This was the case, of course, with the French Revolution of 1789, but other revolutions followed this pattern as well. In every case at least a few critics proposed that the struggling peoples were in some way unfit for self-government. A skeptic writing of the Polish revolution in New York's *Commer-*

cial Advertiser doubted that the Poles possessed the qualities necessary for "the establishment and fruition of free political institutions." Critics appealed to national character to explain a people's unfitness for republicanism, although it was usually unclear whether these alleged traits were supposed to be innate and unchangeable or the product of circumstances—an ambiguity that more optimistic observers pounced on. "It is fashionable to say that France is not good enough for free institutions," James Fenimore Cooper noted amidst the July (1830) Revolution. Yet how else, he asked, could a people be proven ready for freedom than by exercising it for themselves?[4]

These patterns reappeared in 1848–49, with some important exceptions. Americans greeted the first reports from France, and then from elsewhere, with public celebrations and other demonstrations of support. Ardor cooled as the revolutions took strange, threatening directions or as reactionaries reasserted control. In 1848, skeptics raised their voices sooner, and with more authority, than heretofore. Moreover, racist assessments of the revolutionaries' prospects appeared with more frequency in 1848–49, reflecting the growing maturity of racial science and its dissemination into popular culture. In 1848, Americans were in fact less prone to greet news of political unrest in Europe with unalloyed optimism than they had been before. This caution does not mean that the Americans had become inflexibly conservative, that racism had tarnished their view of continental Europe, or that they expected revolutions to follow their model.[5] Rather, the failure of most Atlantic revolutions to establish stable, republican societies left Americans feeling burned. Their aloofness was a predictable, if hardly generous, response to what was, at best, the uneven progress of liberalism in the Atlantic World. If Americans later looked back on the Revolutions of 1848 with bitterness, it is because against all experience they naïvely assumed they would succeed.[6]

Public reaction to news of Louis Philippe's abdication was almost uniformly positive. The Whiggish *New York Tribune* exulted that the revolution "transcends in importance and in promise any other event of the last ten years." Street demonstrations broke out in cities across the republic. In large, attention-grabbing headlines, newspapers announced that France had seen its last monarch. The Senate passed a resolution proposed by Ohio Democrat William Allen offering France the United States' official congratulations, and the House of Representatives soon concurred. News of the uprisings in Vienna, northern Italy, Prussia, and Rome brought more celebration. Americans delighted especially in the revolts in France, their old ally, and in Austria, understood to be one of Europe's most despotic states. In part, Americans' joy stemmed from self-regard: largely

ignoring the local context of the revolutions, they assumed that insurgents were inspired by the American Revolution. In a sermon immodestly titled *America, the Teacher of the Nations,* Elisha Ballantine, pastor of Washington's First Presbyterian Church, told his congregation that "'America' has been the watchword" of European revolutionaries in 1848. Yet Americans also followed news of developments abroad because they sincerely believed that the spread of liberty would calm national rivalries, encourage free trade and the exchange of information, and lead to a more peaceful world.[7]

The thousands of Americans abroad in 1848 were even more enthusiastic than their compatriots back home.[8] "I was there," Philip Claiborne Gooch, a North Carolinian studying medicine in Paris, jotted proudly in his diary on February 24, 1848. He was not exaggerating: Gooch joined the first street demonstrations on February 22, sat on Louis Philippe's throne during the sacking of the Tuileries Palace on the 24th, treated the wounded, wore the "red badge of liberty," and was even "enrolled" as a French citizen during those heady days. Charles Godfrey Leland, a young Philadelphian, was also a student in Paris early in 1848. Like Gooch, he manned the barricades and walked the halls of the Tuileries while a royal carriage still burned in the drive. He felt an almost Wordsworthian thrill at being part of the Revolution: "It is really delightful to be an American here in Paris," he told his father. Gooch and Leland joined roughly three hundred Americans who met to offer the French congratulations and to compliment them on the moderation of their revolution. Americans had not forgotten that prior efforts to establish republicanism in France had ended badly. Samuel Goodrich, who wrote the Americans' address to the provisional government, knew that "all reflecting people" felt anxiety about the ultimate course of the revolution, given the precedents of 1789 and 1830. But Americans discounted that history. They believed that self-government was so instinctive to humanity that they assumed "every nation which undertakes the task, will of course accomplish it." Leland articulated this willing suspension of disbelief when he wrote his father, "*This* revolution is doing its best to be honest and decent."[9]

If Leland let his optimism overcome his caution, other Americans did not. Skepticism toward the revolutions sprang from a variety of sources. History, as Samuel Goodrich suggested, did not augur well for France's success. Americans knew that the hopes of 1789 had devolved into the Terror and empire, and they recalled that the promise of the July Revolution had given way to the monarchy of Louis Philippe. Even in 1830, the young Philadelphian Charles Ellett Jr. instinctively thought of Marat and Robespierre when he encountered some

Frenchmen fleeing a barricade. Eighteen years later, both John C. Calhoun and Joseph R. Underwood, a Kentucky Whig, appealed to that history in urging the Senate not to pass the Allen Resolution. Calhoun reminded his colleagues that it was one thing to decree a republic, but quite another to establish one. Underwood more pointedly argued that France's previous efforts at self-government had "signally failed." Whigs were leery of revolutionary change, particularly when driven by violence, but their initial enthusiasm for the news from Europe in 1848 provoked the editors of their chief newspaper, the *National Intelligencer*, to lecture them that revolution in Paris was as likely to render the city "the tomb as the temple of freedom." If history was any precedent, the odds that republicanism could be established by revolution in Europe—or at least France—seemed long.[10]

Americans also responded coolly for less thoughtful reasons. Margaret Fuller was deeply offended by the apathy of American tourists in revolutionary Italy. Fuller maintained that their insensitivity to revolutionary idealism put these Americans at war with their own national principles. It illustrated how the pursuit of wealth threatened to eclipse republican virtue in American national character. Other Americans could not reconcile the uprisings with their expectations of travel. Americans armed with images of Europe as a land of quaint castles, charming villages, and romantic landscapes—a land, that is, living in the past—had little patience for revolutions that contradicted that image. Harriet Aiken, a privileged South Carolinian who accompanied young Gabriel Manigault on part of his travels, sat down in exasperation on a Paris barricade in 1848 to state "very emphatically that she had not come to Paris to live under a republic. She had enough of that sort of thing at home." Reactionary proslavery theorists like the Reverend James Henley Thornwell joined northern conservatives in charging that European revolutions were the work of "atheists, socialists, communists, red republicans, [and] jacobins." But southerners did not need to be proslavery ideologues to fear France's revolution, which struck directly at their self-interest. The provisional government abolished slavery in France's remaining West Indian possessions, further isolating American slave owners in the Atlantic World.[11]

Criticism spread, and grew more racial in character, as reactionary forces regained the upper hand across the Continent. The radical turn taken in Paris during the bloody "June Days" and the subsequent rightward movement that terminated in the Second Empire under the democratically elected Emperor Napoleon III were also used to confirm negative perceptions of French national character. Joel Poinsett's interpretation of events in Europe illustrates the

progress of racialist thinking particularly well. When Poinsett had visited Sicily as a young man in the first decade of the century, he attributed its poor condition to popery and bad government. But in 1849, he explained that France's travails were due to innate flaws in its national character. France was gravitating toward a dictatorship because that form of government corresponded to its people's "ruling passion, the love of glory," he explained to Martin Van Buren. The *National Intelligencer*, which had counseled caution in the early days of the revolution because of France's turbulent history, also fell back on a character-based explanation after the shocking news of the bloody events of June. The French were naturally prone to "turbulence, violence, and subversion," explained the *Intelligencer*, and hence unsuited to republicanism.[12]

Critics extended the racialist criticism beyond France. Italy, three of whose kingdoms saw revolutions in 1848, fared particularly badly. Americans were deeply conflicted about Italy. They felt a nearly personal connection to its people because of the historical ties they drew between the United States and the Roman republic. Yet travelers struggled to reconcile these feelings with the poverty and despotism they encountered on the peninsula. Early national travelers like Poinsett and Elliot Cresson, the American Colonization Society agent, had blamed religion and government for Italy's troubles. By 1848 some observers had turned this explanation on its head, arguing that Italy's condition was the effect, not the cause, of its people's failings. Nathaniel Niles, a Vermonter serving as the American chargé d'affaires in Turin, believed that self-government might flourish in Sardinia, peopled as it was by "the Yankees of the Italian race." Yet he thought that the character of southern Italy was "so thoroughly imbued with intolerance and the sentiments of hatred personal and political" that republican government could never thrive there. Not everyone was inclined to be charitable with the peoples of northern Italy, however. Virginian John M. Daniel, one of Niles's successors, doubted that self-government could work in any country peopled by "the Latin Races of Europe." The reason the Italian revolutions of 1848 had failed was simple, Daniel explained: "tis'nt in the blood." Sentiment could not appeal to science. Americans did not spare other Europeans from their pitiless racial analysis. George Kendall, European correspondent for the New Orleans *Picayune*, maintained that the failure of Prussian republicans to bring Frederick William to heel stemmed from the want of "patience, stability of purpose, and determination" in the German national character.[13]

This racialist analysis provoked a strong reaction both in the United States and among the community of American travelers. Critics pointed out that this argument amounted to a repudiation of the universalist implications of the

American Revolution and a redefinition of American nationalism. The antiracists' position was not perfectly consistent: most had grave doubts about the capacities of Africans, Mexicans, or Native Americans to handle republican citizenship.[14] What these Americans recoiled at was the application of racial categories to European peoples. In arguing against this trend, critics advanced a broad rejection of the claims of scientific racists. While the latter insisted that the traits fitting a national group for self-government were hereditary and unalterable, antiracists saw them as products of historical development. Young Americans—members of a loose movement dedicated to committing the Democratic Party to economic modernization and the promotion of republicanism abroad—were particularly critical of racialist thinking. Committed to extending the rights of citizenship to German and Irish immigrants to the United States, Young Americans had no sympathy for the argument that Europeans were unfit for freedom in their native lands. His travels through Italy inspired Samuel Cox, a Young American from Ohio, to endorse war—"steel and powder"—as the most efficacious way to loosen the grip of tyrants over Europe's oppressed peoples.[15]

Antiracist sentiment was not limited to progressive elements in the Democratic Party. Younger Whigs, such as Abraham Lincoln and William Seward, kept hopeful eyes on European developments. Seward spoke for this diverse group of antiracists, including but not limited to antislavery Americans, when he declared that "the rights asserted by our forefathers were not peculiar to themselves—they were the common rights of mankind." Travelers, most of whom believed in the capacity of foreign peoples to enjoy the same liberties as they, were particularly critical of the racialist interpretation of the 1848 Revolutions. Women and men with extensive experience in Europe criticized their compatriots for making facile judgments or, far worse, relying on highly prejudicial British opinion to assess the chances for republicanism in Europe.[16] Timothy Dwight took up Margaret Fuller's standard after her tragic death in 1850. Having traveled extensively through Italy, and observing that English writers characteristically charged Italians with "degeneracy," Dwight admonished Americans to "form independent opinions and act like men, Americans, and Christians" in support of Italian liberty. Likewise, a southern traveler cautioned that while the "Anglo-Saxon race" arrogantly deprecated Italian national character, his travels had convinced him that Americans had much to learn about republicanism from Italy.[17]

Travelers insisted that their exposure to European peoples convinced them of their capacity for self-government. But all travel was not created equal. Hasty,

breakneck tourism, such as the kind that produced a favorite, highly superficial genre of antebellum travel writing—the "sketch"—was as bad as not traveling at all.[18] Henry T. Tuckerman, a travel writer with extensive knowledge of Italy, criticized travel accounts that blamed Italy's misfortunes on its people rather than its rulers. Such writings, he charged, could only expose the superficialities of foreign cultures. The "inner circles of a people's existence" could only be revealed by living among them for a considerable period. George Jacques also objected to the British and American penchant for knee-jerk patriotism and impulsive judgments. Admitting that as a young man he had traveled abroad with "an American's prejudices" against European cultures, he urged his compatriots to see Europe with an open mind. But the capacity for empathy had to be accompanied by a timetable that allowed travelers to immerse themselves in foreign societies. He admonished Americans "*not to be too severe* in censuring what little they can understand or know about countries thro' which they steam at the rate of 20 miles an hour!"[19]

These experienced travelers begged Americans not to give up on republicanism in Europe when reactionary authority reasserted itself. Some of them had been overly optimistic about the ease with which peoples could seize their independence and establish self-government. In their disappointment, however, travelers resisted taking the easy paths of cynicism and dejection. They adopted an optimistic, if hardheaded, attitude toward the eventual triumph of liberal principles. Rufus Woodward of Worcester, Massachusetts, was in Paris to see French republicanism devolve into the despotism of Napoleon III. But he did not despair for European liberalism. In the spring of 1849 Woodward believed that France stood, despite its troubles, on "as firm a foundation as our republic did after years of trial." There were challenges: the French needed to learn that reform, not revolution, was usually the wisest course. Also, French workers did not yet understand "that they have no right to demand labor." These were serious, but hardly insurmountable, difficulties. Woodward did not doubt that he would "live to see France a happy and peaceful Republic." Likewise, the children's rights activist Charles Loring Brace traveled through Hungary in 1851. American views of Hungary had utterly changed since the days when readers devoured the latest accounts of their struggle against Austrian and Russian armies. Lajos Kossuth's tour of the United States had begun with great fanfare in 1851, but he departed the next year amidst widespread apathy. Calling upon his traveler's authority, Brace tried to resurrect earlier, more positive views of the Hungarian people. The Tsar's armies, not "the character of the nation," explained Hungary's failure to wrest independence from Austria. "Give them

a good government, and free contact with the world for a half-dozen years," Brace maintained, "and they would equal any nation in Europe in their practical progress."[20]

Naturally not all Americans, and not even all travelers, were so sanguine. The failures of the 1848 Revolutions were a crushing disappointment to liberals. It fortified conservatives and embittered some progressives. In particular, in the revolutions' wake many travelers came to admire Louis Napoleon's administration of France. His firm leadership and efficient administration, including the thoroughgoing renovation of Paris, seemed far preferable to the instability of the Second Republic, especially its working-class unrest—what C. Edwards Lester called "the red hydra of Socialism." But Americans embraced Napoleon III in spite of his authoritarianism, not because of it. Stephen Elliot, a South Carolina cotton and rice planter, believed that Napoleon III had erected the most absolute government in Europe, but he had to admit that his administration had "advance[d] national interests." Samuel Goodrich also had some kind words for the emperor despite his stalwart support for the 1848 Revolution. He admitted that Napoleon III ran his government competently and had the loyalty of the French people. Yet he believed that a "smouldering fire of discontent" lay just beneath the placid surface of French society, and that the emperor only held power via "the vigorous and watchful power of despotism." It would not last. C. Edwards Lester, former U.S. consul at Genoa, agreed with Goodrich's analysis. Louis Napoleon had despotic tendencies, to be sure. But Lester urged Americans neither to judge his government too harshly nor to despair for French republicanism. Rather, Lester argued that the élan of the Napoleon name signified that the French were, in their own way, transitioning between the Bourbonism of the past and the republicanism of France's future.[21]

Americans fixated on the 1848 Revolutions because they had a cosmopolitan, millennial political sensibility.[22] Inevitably, they interpreted the Springtime of Peoples in ways that made sense domestically. Doing so entailed distorting the local context of each uprising. But Americans did not engage with European events because they served domestic ends.[23] They were deeply interested in the revolutions for their own sakes. Americans understood their revolution in international terms, as the first of many blows struck for freedom that, over time, would topple tyrannical regimes across the globe. That millennial optimism was shaken by the triumph of reaction in 1848, but it survived. Charles Leland's experiences in Paris did not leave him bitter. On the contrary, nearly fifty years later he declared, "Even now the memory inspires me." To be sure, Americans abroad were cool, or worse, to disturbances that spilled much blood, threatened

private property, or damaged their economic prospects. Yet they remained supportive of movements for progressive change, even if order was upset in the process. They also positively resisted efforts to denigrate European peoples racially. The Reverend Stephen Olin thought that most of the population of Naples was little more than a "half-naked, dirty rabble." Yet he insisted that "better education and better government might make a fine people of them." Travelers like Olin encouraged Americans to take the long view. Progress was not a linear process, but its ultimate trajectory upward could not be doubted. As Charles L. Brace maintained, "Stupidity and Brutality *can* trample down Nobleness and Freedom . . . but *not for ever.*"[24]

Defining the Anglo-Saxon Race

The racialist analysis of the 1848 Revolutions grew out of the maturation of scientific racism. Propelled by pseudosciences like ethnology and phrenology, racial thought filtered into popular culture, where its influence was felt in fiction, art, and travel literature. In Britain and the United States, race theory invigorated the concept of Anglo-Saxonism, the idea that Germanic peoples—English, German, and sometimes Scottish and Welsh—constituted a single ethnic or racial family. In its purest form, Anglo-Saxonism maintained that those within the circle of "blood" possessed innate biological characteristics elevating them above other peoples.[25] Anglo-Saxonism was not an exclusively racial concept, however. As it was used more generally, it referred to the cultural community inhabited by the English-speaking peoples.[26]

Both the racial and cultural concepts of Anglo-Saxonism encouraged amity between Britain and the United States, despite the sometimes tense diplomatic relations of this period. Yet cultural and racial Anglo-Saxonism had quite different implications for America's orientation to the larger European community. Racial Anglo-Saxons saw no need to foster connections between the United States and non-Anglophone Europe.[27] This exclusivity limited its appeal. Travelers, in particular, had little use for racial Anglo-Saxonism. As was the case in 1848, racialist thinking shut down transatlantic connections—the very links travelers were interested in constructing.[28] Cultural Anglo-Saxonism was not incompatible with cosmopolitanism. While this orientation sometimes produced harsh, bigoted assessments of foreign peoples, it also fostered respect for other cultures. In particular, it held out the promise that the liberties and rights enjoyed by Britons and Americans were not theirs alone but were the common birthright of humanity. Thus, the Anglo-Saxonism characteristic of travelers

between 1845 and 1861 fostered Anglo-American understanding without interfering with Americans' wish to cement their place in the European-Atlantic World.

Racialists assigned to Anglo-Saxon peoples a variety of positive qualities. Some were simply physical traits, such as fair skin, blue eyes, and high foreheads. Others were debatably biological, such as the common conviction that Anglo-Saxons surpassed all other races in their capacity for intelligence. But racial nationalists went well beyond those qualities. They attributed to race a wide variety of virtuous character traits. A Whig writer maintained that Anglo-Saxons could be distinguished from other peoples by their "moral elevation, by religious fervor." A writer in New Hampshire's *Congregational Journal* added to those qualities a long list of his or her own: Anglo-Saxons were marked by "the fearless courage, the indomitable energy, the love of adventure, the inventive genius, the patient industry, the world-wide spirit, sustained and quickened by moral and religious principle." These commentators made it clear that Americans were fully as Anglo-Saxon as Britons. England had transferred to "her offspring," the United States, all of the positive and negative qualities of her national character, a Virginian argued in 1844. Americans must always make it their "greatest boast that we share her blood, and are not unworthy of our lineage."[29]

The language of "blood" suggests how racialists impressed the veneer of scientific legitimacy upon a preexisting sense of Anglo-American kinship. Racialists favored organic language, which helped make their case that political institutions were natural systems, insusceptible to human meddling. One of the era's cruder travelogues explained that the hopelessly enfeebled Italians must, "in the order of Nature," succumb to a "superior people." France might yet be saved, although its feckless people were prone to the "infection" of Catholic religion. But was the Catholic Church the root of France's ills, or was it national character? Racialists were unconcerned with such inconsistencies. The growing prestige of science lent ethnology and phrenology enormous credibility. Travel writers, artists, and other cultural agents could hardly ignore the cachet their products might receive via the association.[30]

Raising up the Anglo-Saxons as a race required denigrating others, and racialists were ready to oblige. Men of science made ambitious claims based on their studies of skull capacity and facial angles. Josiah Nott and George Gliddon, American ethnologists, made the case for a sharply limited definition of the "strictly-white races" in their 1845 study *Types of Mankind*. They categorized Italians, Spaniards, and the French among "dark-skinned races . . . fit only for military governments." It was left to the Anglo-Saxons—Anglo-Americans,

Germans, and Britons—to carry on "the *flambeau* of civilization." The capacity for self-government was embedded in a people's biology, and most Europeans simply lacked it. Via learned studies, public lectures, and review articles, the conclusions of specialists like Nott and Gliddon trickled down into popular culture. They informed the judgments of Joel Headley, a New York Presbyterian minister who toured Europe in the mid-1840s and later became a nativist officeholder in New York. Making the conventional contrast between ancient Romans and modern Italians, Headley doubted whether Italy could ever regain a respectable station among nations. Its people's great fault was the deficiency of their national character. Italians did not suffer from the "headlong impetuosity" that marred the French, but they lacked the crucial ingredient for self-government: "the steadiness of the English." There was no appeal from the judgments of science. "Nations follow the law of human life," Headley explained. Biology decreed that neither France nor Italy could sustain a republican polity.[31]

Some Americans managed to resist the allure of Anglo-Saxonism. Democrats, and in particular those identified with the Young American wing of the party, sustained a vigorous Anglophobia throughout this period. They looked upon Britain as the great foe of European freedom and as the chief obstacle to the expansion of the United States—and, therefore, as the enemy of liberalism throughout the globe. In their eyes, Anglo-Saxonism was nothing short of a betrayal of basic American principles. In a widely publicized 1854 incident, U.S. diplomat Daniel Sickles (who would lose a leg as a Union general at Gettysburg) struck a blow against what he and many others saw as American "toadyism" toward Britain. George Peabody, a Boston-born Anglophile and longtime resident in London, had for several years hosted social gatherings between visiting Americans and his circle of British friends in an effort to bring about closer Anglo-American relations. On July 4, 1854, Peabody hosted a luncheon at the Star and Garter Hotel in celebration of American independence. Sickles, recently named as the secretary of the U.S. legation in London, arrived fully decked out in a military uniform. A notorious hothead and England hater, Sickles became incensed by a number of features of the affair which he considered humiliating to the United States on an occasion marking its national independence.

The most prominent feature of the room was portraits of George Washington, Queen Victoria, and her consort Prince Albert. However, Sickles noted that Washington's was dwarfed by those of the queen and prince. To make matters worse, the "Star-Spangled Banner" and "Hail, Columbia" had been edited (Sickles characterized it as a "mutilation") to remove content offensive to British sen-

sibilities. The first toast was drunk not to President Franklin Pierce, but to the queen, and Sickles was offended by Peabody's obsequious tone. Sickles made a scene by refusing to stand during Peabody's toast, a shocking violation of decorum by a United States diplomat. The incident was widely discussed in London. Opinion in American newspapers divided predictably on partisan lines. Democratic papers praised Sickles for his refusal "to play the fawning minion to royalty." Whig sheets criticized Sickles and Buchanan, the American minister, for endangering Anglo-American relations on such a flimsy pretext. Whigs had a more secure sense of American nationalism, so they were less prone to imagine slights to American dignity. Hence, Whig editors accused the Democratic legation of engaging in a display of republican indignation that only highlighted American insecurity vis-à-vis Great Britain. The *New York Times* wondered if only a prizefight with Prince Albert could satisfy Sickles's "*Americanism*." Still, by his behavior and his handling of the affair in the press, Sickles shrewdly raised his profile in the Democratic Party by calling attention to his Anglophobic bona fides.[32]

Other prominent Democrats used the occasion of a European tour to display their immunity to Anglo-Saxonism. Stephen Douglas embarked on a tour of Europe after the death of his wife and infant daughter early in 1853. The notorious Anglophobe made it a point to tweak the sensibilities of his British hosts. Snubbed by government officials, he socialized openly with radicals, including Lajos Kossuth. Douglas let it be known that he sought an audience with Queen Victoria. As Douglas no doubt knew she would, the queen insisted that he appear in court attire. Douglas refused this demand as unbecoming an American citizen. He left for the Continent without meeting the queen, Democratic papers praising his refusal to cower before the British lion. Anglophobia, not hatred of tyranny, spurred Douglas on. He had no problem reviewing troops with Czar Nicholas I and meeting with Napoleon III later in his tour. Anglophobes insisted that Britain and the United States were natural enemies, regardless of their alleged cultural similarities. Matthew Ward, a Democratic journalist from Louisville, bluntly told Americans that they and Britons shared "no feelings in common." Like other Anglophobes, Ward was uninterested in any kind of kinship with England, racial or cultural. Great Britain was an existential rival to the United States. Claiming that, in 1851, New York ranked only behind London and Liverpool in shipping, Ward taunted, "Hurrah for young America—she will beat them all."[33]

It is impossible to say how many travelers went to Britain for the purpose of reinforcing their Anglophobia, but that number was surely small. Douglas, Ward,

and Sickles were public men who traveled to raise their political profiles by confirming prejudices, not challenging them. Certainly Americans crossed the Atlantic with a variety of negative feelings toward Britain. They expected to find galling extremes of wealth, aristocratic extravagance, and unrelenting hostility toward the United States. Exposure to Britain challenged these assumptions—and, equally important, travelers were open to having them challenged. Henry Gilpin, a gentleman Democrat from Philadelphia, was shocked to find not only hospitality when he visited England in 1853, "but a real disposition to be considerate to us as Americans." Gilpin's political leanings, his literary tastes, and his social circles all prepared him to anticipate hostility from his English hosts. He expected to be confronted about slavery and mobocracy. British attitudes toward the United States had changed, he concluded: "the name of an American is now quite a passport to a friendly reception." George Endicott, a New York printer who toured Europe several years before Gilpin, had the same experience. Sarcastically predicting that his "natural affection for the 'Dear English'" was not likely to be increased by his travels, Endicott reconsidered after his experiences failed to match his expectations. Britain seemed more prosperous, stable, and solidly middle-class than the countries on the Continent. England was "more like home" than any place they had visited in Europe. Most of all, English hospitality contradicted what Endicott thought he knew about their hauteur and anti-Americanism. "We are not going to say any thing against the English any more," his daughter Sarah explained. "They have been so very kind to us."[34]

Other Americans echoed the Endicotts in finding striking social and cultural similarities between Britain and the United States. Many of these travelers employed the term "Anglo-Saxon," but they used it in cultural, not racial, terms. Visiting Britain led Americans to believe that a special relationship could and should exist between the two countries. Because it was cultural rather than racial, that relationship did not preclude embedding the United States in a broader European world. It simply recognized the unique historical ties between the two great Anglophone nations. Despite their maturing sense of national identity, Anglo-Americans continued to look on Britain as their parent country. When Levin Smith Joynes of Richmond, Virginia, disembarked in Liverpool in 1840, he rejoiced to walk on the "soil of my forefathers." Likewise, Stephen Olin felt a "joyous sensation" such as he had never experienced when he first saw the dim outline of "our glorious mother country" after his long Atlantic crossing. These feelings were nothing new—they were exactly what Young Americans referred to when they complained about American deference to Britain—but the cultural Anglo-Saxonism of the 1840s and 1850s had important qualifications lost

on Anglophobes. Americans had long recognized British superiority to the United States in a number of fields, but at midcentury they insisted on the equality of the two Atlantic branches of the Anglo-Saxon family. Second, American Anglo-Saxonism did not idealize Britain. Americans argued for closer ties to Britain despite its flaws. Henry Tappan, who envisioned a grand Anglo-American movement to reform the world, nevertheless deplored the condition of English tenant farmers, whose poverty "grinds out of the human soul both thought and sentiment." The cultural Anglo-Saxonism of midcentury travelers reflected the confident, mature national identity that developed in those years.[35]

Oftentimes travelers did not appreciate the cultural similarities between England and the United States until they left Britain. Visiting the Continent revealed the common foundations of Anglo-American culture. When Caroline White's party entered Prague from Saxony in 1849, it became obvious that they were "in a *foreign land*." The Americans' "*Anglo-Saxon* origin" entitled them to some claim of kinship with the people of Saxony, but in Austria they felt like "*strangers* in every sense of the word." A diverse array of characteristics produced this sense of alienation, but language, religion, foodways, and governmental authority were crucial. In Caroline White's case, an overzealous search of her luggage by Austrian customs agents triggered her feeling of foreignness. Government officials also proved decisive in recalling the familiar comforts of England to the McMurran family of Natchez, Mississippi. In the distance from Dover to Calais in 1854—just twenty-two miles, marveled Mary McMurran—"all is changed, country, climate, people, every thing is different." What struck the McMurrans were the symbols of French despotism contrasted with British liberty—"soldiers and fortifications," and that symbol of state authority, the customs house. Samuel Goodrich explained that elaborate theories of racial ethnogenesis were quite unnecessary to explain the affinity between Americans and Britons. Americans understood the English "because their language, their institutions, their genius, are similar to our own." Other Europeans, even congenial peoples like the French, were a "different civilization" and thus required great time and effort to comprehend. Many Americans only appreciated their closeness to England when they faced the comparatively alien peoples of the Continent.[36]

This feeling of Anglo-Saxon solidarity was by no means an American invention. Britons felt a close feeling of kinship to Americans as well, particularly when they met on the Continent. As we have seen, the two often roomed together and joined as traveling companions when meeting in non-Anglophone countries. They did so not only because of the comfort of conversing in English

in a foreign land but also because the culture they shared allowed them to feel at home in each other's company. When Alfred B. Cobden, a young Englishman, saw that over half of the ships in Madeira's port of San Antonio flew either British or American flags, he noted "Verily the Anglo-Saxon Race carry it with a high hand." Before returning home, Cobden took a tour of Italy, where he fell in with an American student. At first, their common language made their partnership convenient. As they commenced their tour of Florence, however, the pair began to appreciate that they shared a mutual sensibility. The juxtaposition of "magnificence & squalor—splendor & dirt" in Rome was equally alien to the Briton and American, accustomed to middle-class order. They were simultaneously awed and repelled by Catholic churches, but their overall impression of Rome was tragedy, epitomized by one church in which cattle were tethered to the walls. The Englishman and the American both deplored the militarism of Italy. A large garrison of soldiers maintained order in Rome, but they were "spiritless contemptible looking men," not the mighty legionnaires of classical times. Finally, both travelers practiced a broad-minded Protestant faith, attending American-led services in the morning and English services in the afternoon on Sundays. Strangers as they were, the Englishman and American shared a sensibility about authority, progress, and religion that bound Britain and the United States together in a common Victorian culture in the middle decades of the nineteenth century.[37]

Americans did not merely celebrate English culture because it resembled their own. They believed that Anglo-Saxonism was a millennial force that would lead the world into a prosperous, free, peaceful, and Christian future. Racial Anglo-Saxons believed that lesser peoples could be stewarded by the more advanced Anglo-Americans only so far as their limited capacities would admit.[38] Americans abroad rejected this pitiless vision of racial hierarchy. While their conviction that Anglo-Americans would shepherd other peoples into a brighter, liberal order was no doubt condescending, they envisioned a future in which all peoples—all Europeans, at least—participated as equals in a peaceful community of nations. As the first liberal societies, Americans and Britons naturally saw themselves as leaders in this endeavor. Cornelia Grinnan, a wealthy young Virginian, believed that for all its aristocratic flummery, England's "great aim as ours is equality of rights." Thus, she was delighted to discover that English animosity toward the United States had waned. It was essential for world progress, Grinnan believed, that "the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family should appreciate one another & live harmoniously together." Benjamin Moran, a clerk for the U.S. legation in London, heartily agreed with Grinnan. Insisting that

the United States and England were now equals—no longer a daughter, the United States "has assumed in her maturity the novel relationship of a *sister*"—Moran rejoiced that the 1850s had witnessed closer relations between "the two great families of the Anglo-Saxon stock." And while Britain had faults, chief among them poverty and limited suffrage, Moran maintained that British ground was "*freedom's soil;* and from thy shores goes forth the only voice of liberty heard in Europe." Anglo-Saxon unity was essential for the redemption of the world.[39]

As Grinnan and Moran suggested, there were limits to Anglo-American comity. Recognizing England's merits and insisting on the equality of the Anglophone nations did not imply moral equivalence between Great Britain and the United States. Even Anglophiles saw defects in Britain, and more levelheaded observers were far more critical. And, not surprisingly, these observers were largely blind to American flaws. Samuel Goodrich believed Britons to be beguiled by the "spirit of aristocracy," and Cornelia Grinnan discovered that ignorance of the United States was so pronounced that the English regarded an intelligent American traveler as a "rara avis."[40] American Anglo-Saxonism was tempered by the very real geopolitical tensions between the United States and Great Britain between 1845 and 1861, by ambivalence about Britain's aristocratic culture and the social effects of its economic expansion, and by a stubborn Anglophobia rooted in the Democratic Party. It was not, however, limited by Americans' maturing sense of national identity, which developed rapidly during the 1850s. Much like Anglo-Saxonism, nationalism had the potential to shut off the United States from the Old World. In fact, the national identity that developed in the pre–Civil War decade owed much to Americans' sense of difference from Europe. Yet Americans managed to fashion a national identity that embedded them in the Atlantic World. They resisted calls to define nationalism along ethnic or racial lines. Most importantly, their conception of themselves in world-historical development foregrounded their mission to represent republican government to oppressed peoples. American nationalism, as European travelers contributed to it, evolved into a deeply cosmopolitan concept.

The Union, Nationalism, and Cosmopolitanism

In the decades after their Revolution Americans began to develop a sense of national identity. Travel to Europe helped sharpen this concept, in part by offering a negative reference point against which they could define what distinguished them from the Old World. Nevertheless, until the 1840s American

nationalism lacked coherence. Divisions of party, faith, section, and social class produced different understandings of what it meant to be an American. Moreover, the horizons of most people remained focused on their local neighborhood, limiting their sense of belonging to a national community. By about 1845, nationalism in the United States began to cohere around several core concepts on which a large majority of white Americans could agree. This happened at a time when European theories of nationalism began to foreground the ethnic or racial foundation of national belonging. Ethnicity—an amalgam of history, culture, and heredity—was a more flexible foundation for national identity than race. Some theorists began to develop an ethnic-racial myth of American origins that emphasized the Anglo-Protestant foundations of the United States' national character.[41]

Just as they had with strict models of Anglo-Saxonism, Americans received racial nationalism warily. As a multiethnic polity, racial nationalism posed special problems for the United States. It could hardly be denied that, historically, the United States had deep English roots. It was just as obvious that many American citizens had little or no English "blood." These peculiar circumstances left some writers struggling to reconcile America's traditional civic nationalism with the fashionable race-based theories. The "great influence of race in the production of national character" was beyond doubt, a Whig asserted in 1851. However, this writer also claimed that the easy adaptation of "various races" to "Anglo-Saxon language, laws, manners, and customs" proved that race was irrelevant to the development of American national character. American nationalism was idealistic, not racial or ethnic. Not all Americans agreed, of course, but until the late decades of the nineteenth century racist nationalism made little headway in the United States.[42]

Travelers became champions of American civic nationalism. Their writings show that a mature, coherent vision of American nationality had developed by the 1850s. Even though these years saw the emergence of a bitter sectional conflict over the spread of slavery into the western territories, southerners in Europe also affirmed their devotion to the transcendent union. In some respects this national identity defined the United States against Europe: bluntly, America was self-governing, egalitarian, and unified. Despite these contrasts, the emergence of a coherent understanding of American nationhood embedded the United States even deeper into the European-Atlantic World. The development of a sense of nationalism itself was a sign of the vitality of this connection. Nationalist thinking was all the rage in midcentury Europe, and Americans

were clearly paying attention. Most importantly, American national identity bound the United States more closely to Europe because it was millennial. At the core of American nationality was a compulsion to promote—by example, not actively—self-government, equality, and individual freedom, and thereby to see these values spread throughout the world.[43]

It was this world-historical dimension of American nationalism that gave the word "Union," which midcentury Americans preferred to "nation," such profound emotional resonance. There was nothing innate about American nationalism; it belonged to all humanity. As George Bancroft maintained, the races of the earth constituted a "commonwealth" whose destiny was "one day to be put together." In its diversity, the United States had started down the long road to reach this ideal. "Our country stands," Bancroft averred, "more than any other, as the realization of the unity of the race." Americans in Europe after 1845 were among the most enthusiastic proponents of this cosmopolitan vision of American nationalism.[44]

Freedom, meaning both self-government and latitude for individual choice, was one foundation of American nationalism. The abilities to vote, hold office, and express political opinions were goods in themselves, but they also benefited society in very tangible ways. When the Richmond, Virginia, merchant Ambrose Carlton looked back on the agricultural productivity he had seen on his 1854 tour, he concluded that Switzerland "beats all." The reason was simple: it was "a *free country* & things look so much more cheering & prosperous than those poor devils in Italy & Austria." Without self-government to guarantee people the right to enjoy the fruits of their labors, economic activity lagged. Caroline White articulated the other meaning of freedom when she joked that the rivers and streams around Chatsworth (about twenty-two kilometers southwest of Sheffield) were "very republican & democratic . . . behaving just as they had a mind to—restrained only by such wholesome regulations as all honest *free government lovers* are willing to submit to." Freedom for Caroline White meant ordered liberty. Most travelers would have categorized Britain as a free society, at least in contrast to the countries of the Continent, but they would have maintained that individuals had more latitude to behave as they pleased in the United States (British travelers would have agreed). But freedom was not America's birthright alone. It was the duty of the United States to preserve government by consent until the peoples of Europe were ready to adopt it for themselves—a day that could not come too soon. When Margaret Tucker of Virginia heard from her father of an assassination attempt on Napoleon III, she instinctively reflected on

her "inestimable good fortune to live under the beneficent institutions of our glorious land far differently from those whose lots are cast in the dominions of Kings and Emperors."[45]

The most visible sign of Europe's lack of freedom was the soldiers and police forces that travelers encountered everywhere on the Continent. Before the 1848 Revolutions, some Americans had reassessed Europe's security apparatus in light of the mob violence that plagued the United States in the 1830s and 1840s. The ruthlessly effective use of troops to crush the 1848 Revolutions put an end to Americans' dalliance with standing armies. Stephen Salisbury III, like many Americans, was ambivalent about France under Napoleon III. He approved the violent suppression of the June Days uprising and looked on Napoleon's government as a necessary—though hardly ideal—alternative to chaos or socialism. Yet Salisbury had no sympathy with the use of force elsewhere, which upheld an old order that was obviously unjust. In Prussia, Salisbury noted that police forces "lord it over the people, to an extent, which one accustomed to our Democracy, cannot at once believe." Polities that depended on force instead of republican virtue for their maintenance were simply illegitimate. And, travelers were sad to relate, Europe had no shortage of such states. James Johnston Pettigrew of North Carolina echoed Salisbury when he estimated that every third man he passed on the streets of Berlin was "inevitably a policeman or a soldier." The only exception to this pattern was England, where travelers saw the police as public servants, not oppressors. When Ambrose Carlton told his wife that half the population of Naples seemed to be either priests or soldiers, he wished that "England would take *this place* & make them *civilized* people."[46]

The Continent's police forces and armies underscored that self-government and personal freedoms were the privileges of few countries, particularly the United States and Britain. Travelers strained to show to their compatriots at home how a militaristic culture damaged a people's national identity. Their aversion to standing armies did not merely preserve Americans' freedom, explained Peter C. Baker, a New York printer. Putting their trust in citizen-soldiers also guaranteed their prosperity. Standing armies, consuming much but producing nothing, exhausted "the industry of those who find it difficult to gain their own subsistence." The United States owed its peace, prosperity, and democracy—its very existence as a "Happy country"—to its aversion to standing armies, Baker maintained. Caroline White argued that a society that glorified military pursuits distorted the proper relationship between women and men. Agreeing with Baker that soldiers idealized idleness, White argued that countries with military cultures burdened women with hard labor, leaving families, religion, and morality

uncultivated. In Germany and Austria, she charged, men's chief aspiration was to don a "*uniform*—a pipe in the mouth and a glass of beer in the hand." Women, forced to do the heavy labor, became "prematurely old look hard and *haglike*." Like many other travelers, White argued that Britain and the United States were the exceptions to this pattern. Only there, she claimed, could one find elderly women possessed of the "calm placid beauty" appropriate to their rightful place at society's head. Despotism did not only deprive European peoples of their political freedoms; it also spread toxins deep into society, distorting economies, family relations, and the links between people and their government.[47]

Equality, the second principle of American national identity, was at least as protean a term as freedom. Broadly, it had two meanings: equality of condition and equality before the law. As we have seen, in the antebellum decades travelers elaborated on long-standing observations of European poverty to develop an "egalitarian myth" of widespread social mobility, economic equality, and political participation. Travelers also focused on the presence of privileged classes in the Old World to highlight the legal equality enjoyed by all free men in the United States, although ambivalence about gentility muddled the moral distinction Americans wished to make. By the 1850s, travelers had achieved a consensus on how equality contributed to American national identity. Instead of denying the existence of distress in the United States, travelers focused on the class systems that produced extremes of wealth and poverty in Europe. At the same time, Americans became more composed in the presence of privileged women and men. Gratuitous displays of indignation toward royals and aristocrats became less frequent as Americans grew more confident about the survival and eventual triumph of republicanism.

Among the most vigorous proponents of American equality as a counterpoint to European poverty were southern slaveholders. Despite the antagonism generated by the slavery controversy, southerners rejected the calls of their section's proslavery ideologues to use their travels to mount a defense of slavery vis-à-vis free labor. American defenders of slavery insisted that slaves enjoyed better living conditions than workers in so-called free societies, especially England and the northern United States. They argued that a clear-eyed appraisal of the conditions of European workers would demonstrate the superior moral and economic foundations of the South's peculiar institution. In 1851 a New York columnist urged antislavery travelers to visit English factories, where they would see "white images of God" befouled and degraded by their labors. No American who witnessed the "begrimed ghastliness" of British workers could maintain that they were better off than "the comfortably clothed, well-fed, fat and saucy

southern slaves." Yet traveling southerners refused to follow that proslavery script. Rather, their observations of European living conditions led them to praise the fruits of the American—not southern—economic creed, reaffirm their commitment to egalitarianism as a core national principle, and attest to the superior results of free labor.[48]

Southerners abroad confirmed Americans' conviction that an attachment to equality set them apart from Europe. Americans had been raised to believe that Europe was plagued by depths of poverty unknown to the United States. Gabriel Manigault recalled that he expected to see widespread misery in southern Ireland during his 1854 tour, and he "was not disappointed." Travelers exaggerated social mobility in the United States and ignored the desperate poverty to be found in slums like New York's Five Points. They defined the economic sphere as one occupied by white men, thereby ignoring the plight of young women, widows, and free people of color, who struggled just to make ends meet.[49] But in establishing equality as a characteristic that distinguished the United States from Europe, they did not focus on a simple contrast between plenty and want. Rather, they homed in on the extremes of wealth and penury, on the systems of established privilege that they believed made poverty both widespread and intractable. What set America apart was not the absence of poverty, travelers explained; it was the absence of the aristocratic privilege that exacerbated it. Travelers were simply unprepared for the discrepancy between the lives of the rich and poor in the Old World. Egalitarianism had become such an ingrained value to Americans that "untraveled republicans" could form no conception of the splendor of manor houses, "things peculiar to Europe," wrote Levin Smith Joynes. The lives of the urban rich fascinated antebellum Americans, but the "egalitarian myth" assured them that families like the Astors of New York were just very successful ordinary people. Travelers explained that the European rich were a different thing altogether.[50]

Travelers found evidence for America's distinctive commitment to egalitarianism everywhere. Manigault found it in Ireland, and Joynes's observations were inspired by Eaton Hall, the Cheshire seat of the Duke of Westminster. Augustin L. Taveau, a South Carolina planter, was in Cadiz when he stopped to reflect on the oft-remarked absence of great works of art in the United States. "*We* have no grand monuments," he conceded to his sister. But Europe's cathedrals and public buildings only showed how its aristocratic class gratified "its tastes at the cost of overrunning the land with Beggars." America's artistic deficit was the function of a greater good—its commitment to equality for all.

"Thank God I am an American," Taveau declared; "ours is the only land of true prosperity & liberty." The issue here was not primarily the existence of poverty and profligacy, but their causes. Privileged classes monopolized economic resources and spent lavishly to live up to a seigneurial ideal. Aaron Willington, another South Carolinian, was scandalized by Genoa, where "extremes of wealth and poverty are here to be seen at every step." The extravagant spending on churches and on grand palaces was, he claimed, "unknown to our more rational republican countrymen." Southerners like Taveau and Willington resisted the demands of proslavery ideologues that they use their travels to justify their slave system to the world. Unlike some southern intellectuals, they had no interest in devising a proslavery variety of American nationalism. Instead, they paid homage to equality as an American virtue—one that Europe would enjoy also, in time. Virginian James H. Gardner hoped that an American witnessing Italian poverty would not stop at "bless[ing] his own country." He or she must also "cast a benevolent sigh of sympathy upon the degraded population of Europe."[51]

Southern travelers' enthusiasm for egalitarianism may seem confusing given their devotion to slavery, which foregrounded racial inequality and the flaws of free society. Their patriotism may also seem hard to reconcile with the anger stirred by northerners' efforts to limit the extension of slavery. Yet southerners saw no contradiction between slaveholding and egalitarianism, which they understood to apply strictly to whites only. They refused to use their travels as an opportunity to defend slavery at the expense of free labor because they had no objection to it in the American North or Europe. Their quarrel was with how Old World systems of privilege distorted the economy at the expense of ordinary people. Besides patriotism, southerners were devoted to the Union because it worked so clearly in their favor. Plantation agriculture made slave owners rich, and since independence the government had guaranteed the security of slave property practically without qualification. In light of the emancipationist wave sweeping over the Western Hemisphere in the first half of the century, well might white southerners join Augustin Taveau in thanking God they were Americans.[52]

Travel to Europe also confirmed the other meaning of equality, that before the law. Aristocrats and other privileged people had long made Americans uncomfortable. Committed to equality as a principle, yet uncertain how to reconcile it with the code of refinement they also valued, Americans were rarely at ease in the presence of the great. Some travelers groveled, others behaved

rudely, but either extreme betrayed insecurity. By the 1840s, Americans had grown surer of themselves as a nation, more confident that they had struck a balance between gentility and egalitarianism. Having resolved how equality defined their national character, Americans learned how to behave more naturally in privileged companies. They less often felt compelled to demonstrate their republican contempt for aristocracy. This urge did not disappear completely. Democrats, still discomfited by gentility, sometimes felt compelled to make scenes. It was not enough for James Johnston Pettigrew, attending a parade while a student in 1850s Berlin, to demurely keep his hat on when members of the royal family passed. He had to call attention to himself by pressing his hat to his head "doubly tightly." George H. Calvert even objected to American diplomats' conformity to the norms of the capitals in which they served. They "Europeanize and aristocratize" themselves, he charged, instead of dressing and entertaining plainly as republicans should.[53]

Calvert's sentiments were widely shared among fiercely nationalistic Young Americans, some of whom happened to be in high positions in the administration of Franklin Pierce. In 1853, Secretary of State William L. Marcy directed American diplomats to appear at official functions "in the simple dress of an American citizen" so far as local customs permitted. The Democratic press responded enthusiastically, as did some of the more belligerent representatives of the United States, such as John M. Daniel, minister at Turin. More thoughtful diplomats recognized the difficult position in which Marcy's circular put them. John Y. Mason, in Paris, elected to wear the full dress uniform when his deputy was ridiculed by the French press after appearing in plain black. Likewise, James Buchanan elected to don a sword—a compromise acceptable to the queen—after unfavorable press and his understanding that he would be socially ostracized forced him to reconsider wearing only a black suit. Americans abroad agreed that Marcy's directive amounted to a tactless expression of American nationalism.[54]

Some figures—Robert Walsh, in particular—had long been critical of travelers' penchant for making gratuitous demonstrations of their contempt for aristocracy. This sentiment spread in the 1840s as Americans developed a more confident sense of themselves as a nation. As Charles Godfrey Leland observed, an American's refusal to comply with local customs was an expression of insecurity aimed not at the host country, but at one's own fragile sense of nationhood. A traveler "shews his head" by paying respect for local ways, not by "making a fuss because things are not as they *want* them." Margaret Fuller saw some of these Americans while she reported from Italy in the mid-1840s. To these ultra-

nationalists, the "etiquettes of courts and camps, the ritual of the Church, seem simply silly." Yet Fuller was not without hope for this species of American. With "thought and independence" to temper their sense of national brio, they would learn that it was not necessary to reject the whole of the Old World in order to be a good American. They might also realize that Europe had many virtues whose adaptation to American conditions would strengthen the United States.[55]

Leland's and Fuller's sentiments were widely shared among Whiggish travelers, which spurred their criticism of Marcy's circular. They felt that American nationalism was resilient enough to withstand minor compromises to diplomatic etiquette. They also felt that intransigence on such a minor point made the United States look petulant. To an American who had never been abroad, guidelines stipulating ordinary dress for diplomats might well appear sensible. Only travelers could understand that "costume is a necessity at the Courts of Europe, and it is not in the province of America to attempt to break from the custom herself, or to set the fashion for others," the *New York Times*' Paris correspondent explained. Samuel Goodrich argued that instead of raising the profile of the United States, diplomats following Marcy's recommendations would expose the nation to ridicule. Simple politeness enjoined a guest to conform to a host's conditions. Americans opting to dress in plain black were thus guilty of an "act of positive vulgarity." Worse, Goodrich maintained that the dress recommendations hurt the material interests of the United States. American policy ought to be "to cultivate peace with all the world," but the belligerence of the dress circular seemed designed to "array all the nations against us." Marcy's guidelines were an expression of a parochial, brittle nationalism rooted in the Democratic Party. It was poorly suited to the more established, cosmopolitan nationalism of midcentury.[56]

By the 1840s the concept of the Union had acquired resonance as the embodiment of the ties of geography, culture, and history that bound Americans together into a single people. More than an expression of the political connections between the states, Union stood for the organic links between individual Americans. It drew on new, romantic ideas of nationalism that stressed the transcendent relationships that distinguished one national community from another. Union also had an equally important practical meaning: it was the guarantor of self-government and equality. Without Union, the United States would leave itself vulnerable to the violence and poverty that plagued so much of the world. The disunion of the world's premier republic would damage the prospects for freedom everywhere, Americans believed. Travelers insisted that they were

expert witnesses for the benefits of Union, having seen what division had done to Italy and Germany. They also claimed that travel abroad intensified the spiritual links binding Americans to the nation. On July 4, 1851, Samuel Cox felt "the memory of [America's] glad patriotism, bursting from millions of hearts in unison with our own" even though he was a world away, in Istanbul. The Union Americans spoke of in 1850 was not the Union of 1789, an untried political framework, enfeebled by compromises, held together by the barest historical recollections. It had become a nation. Americans in Europe dedicated themselves to making sure people at home understood the absolute value of maintaining it.[57]

Americans abroad exhibited the value of Union via sociability. After the Revolution, travelers tried to compensate for the new nation's weak sense of cohesion by seeking each other out, as if constructing American nationalism one friendship at a time. In the 1840s and 1850s Americans in Europe also sought out each other, but without the almost compulsive drive of the postrevolutionary years. They were confirming a strong, coherent Union, not creating one from scratch. When Stephen Salisbury III went abroad in 1856, he wanted to learn European languages by mingling with native speakers. Thus, he shunned American company, a position unthinkable for an American in 1790 or 1810. However, over time Salisbury's resolve broke down. First, Americans were impossible to avoid. Wherever a circle of Americans existed, they tried to draw him in; "and there is ever a circle," he told his father. More importantly, as his tour progressed, Salisbury found himself missing the company of Americans. By 1857 he was no longer turning down invitations and even began to favor the company of English and American travelers. In June he hosted a dinner party for several Americans from New England and South Carolina. Unlike early national sociability, which created national bonds where none existed, Salisbury's socializing reaffirmed the value of a mature, self-confident Union.[58]

Most travelers did not need to be cajoled into spending time with their compatriots. Americans from disparate regions came together and bonded during the long, nerve-wracking ocean voyage. Passengers who violated the unspoken rules of sociability risked severe sanctions. One lady on board the *Columbus* during Levin Smith Joynes's crossing insulted the "republican community" by putting on airs, causing her to be shunned. As they crisscrossed the Continent, Americans encountered many more of their compatriots than they had on the Atlantic crossing. Their common nationality impelled them to make friendships. An American company could always be found at the residence of U.S. ministers in foreign capitals. Prospective diplomats had to anticipate the expenses of

constant socializing, which they had to bear themselves. Mary Anne Mason, daughter of U.S. minister to France John Y. Mason, spent "merry evenings [in] cheerful company" as chief hostess in her father's residence. Diplomats welcomed individual travelers and their families on a day-to-day basis, and the grind could be wearing. Compatriots or not, not all Americans were agreeable. After one New York family left for the evening, Mason admitted, "Their absence causes me no sensation—save perhaps one of relief!" Besides these daily responsibilities, diplomats also held large parties on July 4th and sometimes other occasions, such as Washington's Birthday. All the resident Americans could expect an invitation to these affairs, which ritually celebrated the ties of Union. Attending the Washington's Birthday party in Berlin at the residence of U.S. minister Peter Dumont Vroom in 1857, Stephen Salisbury noted that, after "a posh supper," one guest per state was invited to give a speech in honor of the first president.[59]

Most meetings between Americans were serendipitous—and more joyful for it. When Caroline White's party learned that some young Americans had booked into their hotel in Heidelberg in 1855, she could hardly contain her excitement to meet "*our country people*." Margaret Tucker met many Americans as the daughter of diplomat Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, but her favorite was one Kentucky lady who was so high-spirited that she felt "at home directly." The two "enjoy[ed] having a talk together of America very much indeed." Although Americans were constantly mistaken for Britons by continentals—and oftentimes by the British themselves—they claimed they could instinctively recognize each other. While on his second tour of Europe, in the mid-1850s, Gabriel Manigault mocked one Briton who mistook him and a companion for Englishmen. One "could see at an instant" that they were Americans, Manigault wrote indignantly. In Dublin, Manigault saw at a distance two young men who were "unmistakably American." He was right: introducing himself, he discovered they were Virginians. In the joy of Margaret Tucker and Caroline White and in the American-detecting powers of Gabriel Manigault we can see the reverence Americans felt for the idea of the Union. While not insensitive to local or regional connections (White was particularly happy to find that some of the Americans in Heidelberg were "*Yankees*"), travelers identified primarily with a national community. Americans enacted the Union every time they met strangers who turned out to be Americans by treating each other as if they were already friends.[60]

The battle over slavery's expansion increasingly threatened the fraternal Union celebrated by travelers. Antislavery northerners occasionally shunned slaveholders as moral pariahs. While on board a Genoa-bound steamer in 1856, a

Virginia friend of Gabriel Manigault accepted the arm of a young New England woman. But when she let slip that she "utterly abhorred all of her country-people who were slaveholders," the man informed her that he was proud to be the owner of "two old people who were his slaves at his old home in Virginia" and stormed off. In turn, some slaveholders avoided Americans they believed to be hostile to slavery. The Parker family, from South Carolinia, was sailing down the Nile in 1858 when they saw the stars & stripes flying from two adjacent barges. They were wary, however, knowing that the Americans they had encountered in Egypt thus far were "almost universally northerners and especially *Bostonians*—so that we not only do not *fraternize* with them but avoid them, making acquaintance with any other nation in preference." White southerners associated New England with antislavery sentiment. Antislavery did more than strike at the heart of slaveholders' livelihoods—it branded them as moral reprobates. Southerners were deeply offended by the indictment of their way of life, but they believed that critics of slavery lacked moral perspective. In threatening the arguably minor evil of slavery, abolitionists endangered a positive good—the Union.[61]

Yet slavery did not split the bonds of Union among Americans abroad. Few southerners avoided northerners out of a fear that they harbored antislavery sentiments, and fewer northerners spurned southerners because they objected to slaveholding. Americans worked hard not to allow the controversy over slavery's expansion to destroy the Union, and travelers in Europe did their part to maintain comity between the sections. James Johnston Pettigrew, a stalwart defender of southern rights, launched into an anti-abolitionist tirade upon being introduced to an Alabamian in 1850 while studying in Berlin. He soon discovered that the young man was the son of James G. Birney, the antislavery politician. Pettigrew was aghast—not at Birney, but at his own rude behavior. He was even more chagrined when subsequent acquaintance proved that Birney was a pleasant, civil young man. Pettigrew admitted after a few weeks, "I think he is a pleasant fellow." Gabriel Manigault's encounter on the Genoa steamer proved to be an exception, as the "American colony" he lived among in Paris was "given to worldly amusements" and indifferent to slaveholding. Another time he met the wife of an American diplomat from a western state who told him she looked down on slaveholders, but after they spent a pleasant day touring Melrose, the home of Walter Scott, the woman "decided to make an exception in [his] favor." Until 1860–61 both slave owners and moderately antislavery northerners refused to value the expansion of slavery dearer than the Union.[62]

As Manigault's and Pettigrew's cases suggest, Americans used a European sojourn as a refuge from the divisiveness of American politics. Travelers resented when Europeans chided them over slavery, forcing even some antislavery northerners to come to the South's defense.[63] It is clear that travel abroad intensified nationalistic feelings among northerners and southerners alike. While crossing the Atlantic on the steamer *Arctic* in 1851, Kate Jones recorded, the southern passengers gathered together to reminisce about their homes and exchanged "anecdotes & incidents of our negroes." A few weeks after disembarking in England, a northerner introduced himself to Jones, seeing that she was an American. Jones snapped, "I am not only an American, but from *the South too*," but quickly apologized for her remark. On foreign soil, it was important "to know that we claim one *fatherland*—sectional differences seem forgotten." Even the Parkers, the South Carolina family who avoided Bostonians, tempered their anti-northern views as their tour progressed. In Rome several weeks after their Nile cruise, they were happy to discover "a great many nice Americans," singling out several northern families. "I shall go back to America better satisfied on the whole," Amelia Parker declared. "When one considers the *age* of America compared to Europe, we are a *great* and *go-ahead* nation."[64]

As the Parkers' experiences suggest, white southerners were conflicted about the slavery controversy in the United States. Northerners' antislavery views, which they could not help interpreting as attacks on their moral integrity, offended them deeply. But they were by no means convinced that disunion was the remedy, a position that frustrated southern nationalists to no end. In fact, European travel after the failures of 1848 helped both northerners and southerners understand the absolute value of the Union both to the United States and to the future of freedom and human rights the world over.[65] Regarding Italy's failure to win its independence from Austria, William Ware explained that its many kingdoms were "all of them what our South Carolina is . . . ready to throw the world into universal confusion and war." As if the lesson were not clear enough, Ware maintained, "A few Carolinas would reduce our country to the miserable condition of the Italian republics."[66]

Southern travelers agreed wholeheartedly with this analysis. When in 1851 Aaron Smith Willington left Genoa, garrisoned by Austrian troops, and arrived at Civitavecchia, watched over by the French, it struck him as a clear example of the value of the Union. The "distracted and divided condition of the Italian States," Willington insisted, should teach an "impressive lesson" to Americans. Disunion would bring war, poverty, and foreign domination. It would also prevent

the United States from taking its rightful place at the vanguard of world progress. Matthew Ward argued that only travel could show Americans "*how* to love the Union and its institutions." Only by seeing "the empty parade and abject misery of other nations" could an American appreciate the benefits conferred by the Union. Europe did not provide only negative examples of the Union's value. Switzerland's peace, prosperity, and honest administration, observed Virginian Conway Robinson, offered an appealing contrast with the other states of the Old World. He concluded with a powerful endorsement of the Union: "The tendency of a trip to Europe is to make any reflecting American more and more pleased with the republican institutions of his country, and more and more convinced of the manifold advantages resulting from our glorious Union."[67]

Slave owners were among the most enthusiastic proponents of the Union. They resisted the arguments of southern nationalists, who maintained that the slave states had become so distinct from the northern states as to constitute a separate nation. Events of 1860–61 would prove that their devotion to the Union was not absolute. Nevertheless, southern travelers' statements about the meaning of the Union indicate that southern nationalism and extreme proslavery ideology, both of which disparaged the value of the Union and maintained that the North had become different from and hostile to the South, made only shallow inroads into southern culture. Southerners were proud Americans and Unionists, which helps explain the deep divisions that plagued so much the South as it debated secession during the winter of 1860–61. Southerners and northerners believed that the Union was the guarantor of American equality and self-government. It made the United States feared and respected in a dangerous, hostile world. And, not least, Union was a beacon to freedom-loving people around the world. This cheerful, self-congratulatory vision was not contested by many southerners, but it was challenged from another quarter. Travel to Europe afforded antislavery travelers, especially black abolitionists, with a critical perspective with which to assess American national identity. It did promote equality, and it did provide self-government—if one was white. To peoples of African descent, the United States was as caste-ridden as the most hierarchical Old World society.

The Aristocracy of Race: Abolitionists Abroad

Exposure to European societies reinforced Americans' providential nationalism. The United States was self-governing, egalitarian, and unified. It was, they

believed, the chief hope of progress in a world dominated by oppression and despair. Antislavery travelers dissented from this consensus. They argued that the Union, as the protector of slavery in an increasingly free Western world, was the chief obstacle to progress. A group of antislavery women reminded Europeans that "their freedom makes progress only in exact proportion as our slavery is brought into discredit." Abolitionists did not merely focus on the legal apparatus of slavery, however. They identified racism as the root evil without which slavery could not exist. Racism prevented the friends of republicanism from supporting the United States and gave comfort to reactionaries. Antislavery was the true voice of patriotism, a correspondent to the *North Star* explained. Slavery deprived America of "the grand moral lesson" it might teach the world and thus was "hailed with pleasure and pointed to with triumph" by despots. The United States was in no position to redeem others when it needed redemption itself. American hypocrisy—accusing Europe of harboring an aristocracy of class when the United States established an aristocracy of race—exposed the hollowness of its self-image. Abolitionists thus provided an alternative, highly critical interpretation of American nationalism and the Union's place in the Atlantic World.[68]

Antislavery women and men indicted the United States for establishing its own, unique form of hierarchy based not on gender or class, but on skin color. Racism gave the lie to white Americans' cherished belief that they represented equality to the world. Travelers denounced Europe for its aristocracy, but Frederick Douglass observed that "there is none based on the color of a man's skin. This species of aristocracy belongs pre-eminently to 'the land of the free, and the home of the brave.'" Americans had toppled one form of aristocracy merely to erect another, more insidious one in its place. The British abolitionist Joseph Sturge charged that the United States embodied, "notwithstanding their political theory to the contrary[,] an aristocracy of the worst kind—*An aristocracy of colour.*" Class boundaries might be crossed by individuals of great wealth or merit, but the walls of color were insurmountable. Some proslavery southerners agreed, arguing that only a servile "mudsill" class, clearly set apart by race, preserved social equality among whites. As William J. Grayson proclaimed, "To constitute a democratic Republic there must be an aristocracy of color and race." Northerners were uncomfortable with this analysis since it degraded labor by associating it with African slavery. In branding racism as a form of aristocracy, abolitionists had touched a nerve. They tried to shame Americans into recognizing the incompatibility of slavery and racism with fundamental American values.[69]

Maintaining that slavery and racism put Americans at war with their own principles lay at the heart of antislavery travelers' appeal. William Allen fled the United States for England after marrying one of his white students from New York Central College. He told his English hosts that, despite Americans' belief that they were "Heaven's Vicegerents, to teach to men, and to nations as well, the legitimate ideas of Christian democracy," their racial caste system was "the most cruel under the sun." Abolitionists undermined Americans' most cherished myth about their Union—that it would be at the vanguard of the regeneration of the world. The enemies of slavery told Americans that they were the opposite of their self-image: not the enemies but the agents of oppression. Abolitionists demanded that if Americans stood for freedom for Europeans, it required that they do so for African Americans. "You who of Garibaldi rave / And howl at Bourbons, chain this slave!" a British poet wrote. Americans' frequent affirmations of their support for freedom and equality gave antislavery activists plenty of opportunities to demonstrate the hypocrisy at the heart of American nationalism. As Sarah Remond told a meeting in Wakefield, in West Yorkshire, a "stranger from England who happened to be in the States on the 4th of July, and heard the constant declamation about liberty, would not for a moment dream that one portion of its people were groaning under a hopeless despotism."[70]

In order to make the charge of hypocrisy credible, abolitionists had to show that racism was a uniquely American phenomenon. Antislavery travelers maintained that Europeans did not discriminate against African Americans. The charge that racism was exclusive to the United States appears constantly in the writings and speeches of antislavery activists. When she visited England to attend the 1840 World Anti-Slavery Convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton encountered "none of that prejudice against color . . . which is so inveterate among the American people." British abolitionists and American blacks made the charge most commonly, however. It peppered nearly every speech made by black abolitionists to British audiences, which, if newspaper reports can be believed, cheered wildly at the contrast between British equality and American racism. Abolitionists did not merely insist that Britain was less racist than the United States. Like William Allen, who wrote of the "entire absence of prejudice against color" in England, they argued that the British treated people of color without discrimination of any kind. British abolitionists agreed enthusiastically. Upon Charles L. Remond's departure from Scotland in 1842, George Thompson boasted that Remond had been "hailed as a man—cherished as a brother—

caressed as a friend." Some activists even maintained that racism was unknown throughout Europe. Mocking the American argument that "anti-black passion is . . . a 'law of nature,' " an antislavery traveler insisted that color prejudice "has never existed in Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, the Italian States, Prussia, Austria, [or] Russia."[71]

British and African American abolitionists did not merely point out the contrast between American racism and European toleration. Rather, they argued that it proved that Britain—not the United States—was the beacon of progress for the Western world.[72] Indeed, there is a joyful quality to the relentlessness with which these two groups joined in this line of attack.[73] William Powell, who fled with his family to England for fear of the 1850 Fugitive Slave Act, attributed what little racial prejudice he found there to visiting Americans. But for their influence and the "paraphernalia of hereditary monarchy," Powell argued that Britain was "the only strip of land in the whole world approaching nearer to and devoted to the *pure principles of a righteous civil government*." Among American abolitionists, Frederick Douglass made this contrast a centerpiece of his antislavery brief. "I went to England, monarchial England, to get rid of Democratic slavery," Douglass told an American audience in 1847, and he was satisfied "that I had gone to the right place." Douglass reveled in juxtapositions that played havoc with Americans' images of themselves vis-à-vis Great Britain. "Liberty in Hyde Park is better than democracy in a slave prison," he told William Lloyd Garrison; "monarchial freedom is better than republican slavery." White abolitionists sometimes signed on to this indictment. At the conclusion of a long assessment of the pros and cons of Britain and the United States, the Vermont abolitionist Asenath Nicholson concluded, "Truly, [Britain] is the 'land of the free and home of the brave.' "[74]

British abolitionists echoed this charge with even more enthusiasm than black abolitionists made it. When introducing visiting American speakers to British audiences, local activists pointed out that slavery and racism exposed the hollowness of Americans' progressive self-image. In his introduction to the autobiography of Jeremiah Asher, Wilson Armistead, a Leeds abolitionist, charged that slavery in the United States was the worst "of all the crimes . . . which have stained the annals of time." Britons made no distinction between blacks and whites, but racial hatred was "inveterate" in "professedly free and enlightened America . . . a land boastful of its freedom and of its liberty." During Charles L. Remond's speaking tour of Britain, an Irish newspaper found it unaccountable how Americans could uphold slavery and yet be "the loudest vaunters

of the happiness and beauty of unrestricted American freedom." Britons' regard for this line of attack on proslavery America caused a minor international incident in 1860. During the opening session of the International Statistics Congress in London, Lord Brougham pointed out to George M. Dallas, the American minister, the presence of an African American (Martin Delany) in the Canadian delegation. Dallas said nothing and remained in his seat, but he refused to attend subsequent sessions. The American delegation, led by Augustus Baldwin Longstreet of Georgia, withdrew. Dallas maintained his silence, but Longstreet vented his anger in the press. He characterized Brougham's action as an "assault upon our country." Brougham had acted on his own accord. The controversy horrified the Palmerston ministry, which made overtures to conciliate Dallas. Nevertheless, Brougham's effort to embarrass the United States by drawing attention to British hospitality to Delany was a favorite tactic among African Americans and their transatlantic allies.[75]

Abolitionists saw clearly the limitations of Americans' conceit that they represented freedom, equality, and self-government to an oppressed world. White Americans had constructed their national identity on a weak foundation, and antislavery travelers and their British allies did not have to dig very deeply to undermine it. However, the antislavery critique of Americans' sense of their place in the Atlantic World was not without problems of its own. The argument that Europeans welcomed African Americans as equals was plainly an exaggeration that damaged abolitionists' credibility. Black travelers were also poorly served by their British allies, who harped on American flaws but seemed unconcerned with domestic social ills. Antislavery travelers should have known that national pride, to say nothing of Anglophobia, would make it difficult for Americans to listen to their message dispassionately. The obvious pro-British slant of the antislavery critique of American nationalism made it easy for Americans to dismiss it entirely. But the abolitionist case was also marred by internal inconsistencies. White abolitionists were critical of the United States but still believed that its merits overcame its defects. Black abolitionists were more prone to argue that racism was a core feature of American national identity, but even they could not escape the gravitational pull of nationalist ideology.

Black abolitionists and their British allies understated the degree of racism in Britain. British prejudice must have seemed inconsequential when compared to the American variety. As William Powell said, "*American liberty is a mockery. British liberty is an existing fact*." As we have seen, however, abolitionists made unqualified statements about British equality. Yet black abolitionists often encountered racial discrimination during their travels. Despite buying a first-class

ticket, Sarah Parker Remond was refused "equal privileges" with the other passengers on her Cunard liner during her 1859 Atlantic passage. Blacks were accustomed "to receive insult from the majority of the American people," she told the *Scottish Press*. "We do not expect it under English influences." Racist placards greeted Frederick Douglass in Belfast during his 1846 lecture tour, and William Lloyd Garrison was surprised to find not only apathy but "actual proslavery" in Britain during his visit that same year. In 1850–51, the fugitive slave John Brown left Bristol after he found "there is prejudice against color in England . . . as more generally in America."[76]

Racial prejudice could even be found in the British abolitionist community. Audiences were more easily moved by the plight of light-toned than dark-skinned fugitives. The *Leeds Mercury* described William G. Allen as "an intelligent gentleman of but light colour," and Allen sought to win sympathy for enslaved Americans by arguing that African Americans were "thoroughly Anglo-Saxonized." One out of five slaves, he insisted, was as white-skinned as any Englishman. Ellen Craft's case affords the clearest example of British antislavery racism. Crowds that stood unmoved by the tales of dark-complexioned speakers became enraged after seeing Craft, who had escaped from slavery by "passing" as a white woman. William Wells Brown, who accompanied Ellen and her husband William during their speaking tour in the early 1850s, explained that Britons could not fathom why "one so white and so ladylike as Mrs. Craft should have been a slave." At an 1859 meeting in London, the Reverend T. E. Thoresby expressed his indignation upon hearing Ellen Craft's life story because she did not have "the slightest appearance of a slave or an African about her." Unlike other abolitionists, however, Thoresby had a moment of clarity: he realized that accounts by dark-skinned fugitives did not move him nearly so much as that of the "white lady," even though "the evil of Slavery" applied equally. Thoresby's insight revealed where Britons were "with reference to the prepossession in favour of colour," he told his audience.[77]

Thoresby's admission was exceptional; the myth of British racial egalitarianism had too many uses for it to be discarded merely because it was illusory. Racist sentiment did rise throughout Britain during the 1840s and 1850s, at the same time that it remained useful for abolitionists to deny it. The British government took a more friendly tack in Anglo-American relations, making overt anti-Americanism disrespectable. Economic ties continued to bind the two countries closer together. Scientific racism began to enter British culture. Blackface minstrelsy became enormously popular beginning in the 1830s, and ordinary people seem to have absorbed via these entertainments many of the racist

stereotypes common in the States. Economic conditions in the post-emancipation West Indies prompted many Britons to reassess their antislavery beliefs. Yet British racism was an inconvenient fact to visiting abolitionists. It deprived the ideologically useful contrast between British freedom and American slavery of its clarity. British nationalists, who found the contrast a useful way to discredit the United States, also continued to ignore it.[78]

Abolitionists also hurt their case by leaving it vulnerable to Anglophobia. Any indictment of the United States that included British voices would have enraged Anglophobes, but even moderates were offended when abolitionists condemned the United States in front of British audiences. Critics asked why Britons pried into American affairs when they had no shortage of their own social problems. "Why are the English meddling only with American slavery, without attending to their own kindred and even worse systems of degradation and suffering?" asked Henry Bascom, president of Transylvania University. Critics of antislavery argued that the silence of British and American activists on the condition of the British poor—to say nothing of British policy in Ireland and India—could only be explained by anti-Americanism. British interference in American affairs was the focus of an international controversy in 1852, when the Duchess of Sutherland entreated American women to ameliorate the condition of southern slaves with an eye to their gradual emancipation. Responding to the so-called Stafford House Address, former First Lady Julia Gardiner Tyler recommended that the Duchess go "on an embassy of mercy to the poor, the stricken, the hungry and the naked of your own land." Tyler's response was one of the more refined expressions of the widespread American resentment of British moral high-handedness, which portrayed Americans in need of reform, instead of the reformers.[79]

The self-satisfied tone of British antislavery activists also rankled Americans. It invited them to wonder whether abolition was merely a pretext for boosting British patriotism. John B. Estlin told Britons that the struggle against American slavery should give them "a greater admiration of the sanctity and even-handedness of English laws, and a deepened attachment to our modified form of monarchial government." Other abolitionists argued that British virtue justified interference in the affairs of sovereign nations, including the United States. The Reverend Hugh Allen told a cheering audience that England welcomed the fugitive slave John Anderson because "where oppression exists, the hand of England is put forward." Allen dismissed those who charged that Britain shared the stain of slavery because of her own history of slaveholding. Britain had

atoned by abolishing slavery and, besides, had never allowed it to exist on its soil. "We have felt the glory of our position," Allen announced grandly.[80]

The haughty and anti-American rhetoric of British abolition helped discredit the movement in the United States. Proslavery writers had little trouble branding black abolitionists in particular as British dupes.[81] Even Americans with no sympathy with proslavery radicalism could not accept the radical abolitionist portrayal of the United States as a reactionary force. Some black abolitionists seem to have noticed that they had gone too far. While still focusing on spreading the antislavery gospel, they wondered whether it was good morals or good policy to ignore British suffering. Black abolitionists were sensitive to British evils, and working-class audiences encouraged them to point out the similarities between American slavery and British poverty. Visiting African Americans were understandably wary of insulting their hosts, however.[82] William Wells Brown and William Allen lectured on a variety of topics during their time in Britain. Knowing that it might alienate some Britons, Brown nevertheless worked with temperance, peace, education, and working-class reformers. William Allen took up the cause of the British poor for a practical reason. Because conservatives parried antislavery arguments by charging that abolitionists did not care about the plight of white workers, Allen planned to participate in antipoverty activity. "So true it is that all reforms go together," he told Charles Sumner.[83]

Most black abolitionists stuck to antislavery touring, however. They feared that involvement in other reforms would dilute their core message. They also were loath to alienate their hosts by meddling in British affairs (the irony was not lost on proslavery Americans). Finally, their Anglophilia blinded them to the magnitude of British social problems. Frederick Douglass occupied all three of these positions. I "only claim to be a man of one idea," Douglass explained to Richard Webb. "Although there are other good causes which need to be advocated, I think that my duty calls me strictly to the question of Slavery." Both Douglass and the Crafts denied that the condition of the British poor was in any way comparable to that of American slaves. Douglass even minimized English complicity in the Great Famine. He attributed Irish poverty to intemperance and Catholicism. He maintained that American attention to Ireland was designed to deflect attention away from slavery.[84] Douglass denied that he had appealed to anti-American prejudices while abroad. He explained that he sought British support because of the great influence of its opinion in the United States, a position that other black abolitionist speakers echoed. In "The Right to Criticize

American Institutions," a speech he delivered upon his return from England in 1847, Douglass maintained, "I do not hate America as against England, or against any other country or land. I love humanity all over the globe." Considering the relish with which Douglass had contrasted "monarchial freedom" to "republican slavery," it is hardly surprising that American critics were not mollified.[85]

Going to Europe transformed black abolitionists' perspective on the place of the United States in the Atlantic World. The United States was not the political redeemer of Europe; it was a sinning nation in need of redemption. White Americans, including most white abolitionists, could not accept this interpretation. We have seen that Americans were willing to believe that Europe had much to teach them, but the radical inversion that black abolitionists and their British allies proposed was too much for them to accept. White abolitionists disputed their black colleagues' brief in two particulars: they rejected their Anglophilia, and they argued that slavery tarnished, but did not fundamentally mar, American national character. The racial alienation that black abolitionists had experienced their whole lives led them inevitably to the conclusion that the United States had established an aristocracy of race. The privileges of whiteness prevented all but a few of their white colleagues from understanding that.[86]

Visiting England reinforced black abolitionists' preexisting Anglophilia. Britain had established itself as the enemy of slavery by emancipating its West Indian slaves in 1833, by welcoming fugitives into Canada, and by maintaining an organized movement dedicated to stamping out slavery in the Western Hemisphere—especially the United States.[87] Traveling abroad did nothing to dispel African Americans' infatuation with Britain. Its abolitionists treated them with respect; they spoke in front of large, rapt audiences; and they moved around with a freedom unthinkable in the United States. Their experiences could only reinforce their already firm sense that American ideals of freedom and equality were a sham. William Wells Brown wrote that the warm treatment he had received in England (the "fatherland") had led him to think of himself as "an Englishman by habit, if not by birth." As the time for his return to the United States approached, he contrasted the racism at the heart of American national character with the "hatred of oppression" instinctive to Britons. Sarah Parker Remond also discovered that travel in Britain enabled her to appreciate how slavery had "completely blinded the moral perception of the [American] people." Black abolitionists indulged their love of Great Britain by sightseeing as well. They dutifully toured manor houses and castles, lavished praise on the countryside, and saw the lions of London. Their devotion to Walter Scott rivaled

that of other American Anglophiles. William Wells Brown visited Stirling Castle and toured the Trossachs with *The Lady of the Lake* in hand. They paid homage to Britain's monarchs, as when William and Ellen Craft praised "England's good, much-beloved, and deservedly-honoured Queen."[88]

White abolitionists, already stung by charges that they were British toadies, took a harder, more nationalist line against Britain.[89] When Henry Stanton overheard Thomas Campbell, author of an oft-quoted poem mocking the United States flag, disparaging American poetry at the 1840 London meeting, he interrupted with a belligerent defense of American verse. "I was not disposed to sit still," he recalled, "and hear Bryant, Whittier, and Longfellow abused by any British bard." Stanton may have had black abolitionists in mind when he attributed English disdain for the United States to the "servility of our tourists in that country." White abolitionists were disinclined to excuse British policy in Ireland or hold their tongues over British class relations. Sharply disagreeing with Frederick Douglass, Elizabeth Cady Stanton maintained that Ireland's "ruin" could not be laid on its people's character or the Roman Catholic Church. She noted, "Historians give us facts showing English oppressions sufficient to destroy any nation." Finally, white abolitionists were resistant to the charms of British aristocracy. They did not behave with the aggressiveness typical of hypernationalists, but they did try to affect insouciance among the great. The English guests at a party at Samuel Gurney's house in 1840 were acutely self-conscious in front of the Duchess of Sutherland and Lord Morpeth, but the Americans were all ease, according to Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Among white abolitionists the Motts were the most deeply offended by aristocratic indulgence. Windsor Castle was just one of many "monuments of the extravagance and folly of the British nobility," observed James Mott. He was even more affronted by the deference of ordinary Britons—even fellow Quakers—toward aristocrats. It was all "disgusting to an American republican," Mott wrote.[90]

Underneath these divergent assessments of Great Britain lay disagreements about the moral position of the United States in the Atlantic World. White abolitionists, while bitterly critical of the hypocrisy at the heart of American national identity, believed that racism tarnished American ideals but did not corrupt them utterly. Black abolitionists, reviled as outsiders, were more prone to argue that American nationalism was rotten at its core. Whiteness's power to drive a wedge between the perspectives of white and black abolitionists is powerfully illustrated by an encounter between the party of Lucretia and James Mott and a Georgia slave owner in Scotland in 1840. Realizing whom he had encountered, the slave owner offered some proslavery commonplaces, but the Motts were

more interested in Walter Scott than disputation. They invited the Georgian to join them as they toured Abbotsford. They allowed him to row them across the lake. The moral juxtaposition within the company became a source of amusement. Abby Kimble, Lucretia Mott noted, "laughed at him [the Georgian] for having such a company of Abolitionists under his charge." One only has to recognize the impossibility of Frederick Douglass or Ellen Craft spending a carefree afternoon in a rowboat with a slaveholder to appreciate how difficult it was for white abolitionists, unconscious as they were about their own racial privileges, to appreciate how white privilege distorted American national identity.[91]

Not surprisingly, white and black abolitionists disagreed about how deeply racism tarnished American nationhood. Blacks insisted that racial prejudice pervaded American culture, nearly spoiling the whole. Whites tended to see it as one flaw in an otherwise admirable cluster of qualities. Frederick Douglass articulated the former sentiment when he remarked, "To hate a Negro in America is an American boast, and is a part of American religion. Men glory in it." British and even some white American abolitionists agreed. The Leeds abolitionist Wilson Armistead echoed Douglass, insisting that hatred of Africans was "deeply-rooted and inveterate in the American mind." Wendell Phillips, the aristocratic American abolitionist, identified racism as the root of the "rottenness of the American character, the arrant corruption, the shameless want of delicacy." But it was black abolitionists who, from their unique vantage point within, yet outside of, American society, made this argument most convincingly. Returning African Americans took pains to stress they came back to the United States not out of any feeling of patriotism, but in order to carry on the fight in the arena. William Wells Brown's daughter explained that he left England because "his soul yearned to be where the great battle of freedom was being fought." He mocked the idea that he was making an emotional return to his "native land." Douglass likewise denied any sentimental attachment to the United States. "I have no love for America," he explained in 1847. "I have no patriotism. I have no country." He returned for the fight, and for his family, and that was all.[92]

Whites did not agree. They argued that racism was a stain that, when removed, would allow the United States to take its rightful place at the vanguard of world progress. James Mott returned to the States "far better satisfied with its customs, conditions, institutions, and laws, (slavery excepted,) than with those of the mother country." Nationalism was a powerful force. Only the most radical abolitionists could resist its pull. In fact, black abolitionists found it difficult to reject completely the conceit of American exceptionalism.[93] Even Frederick

Douglass asserted that would but America "wipe off this foul blot from the otherwise fair fame of the American people . . . its brilliant beams would flash across the Atlantic, and illuminate the Eastern world." Antislavery travelers often employed the image of the "foul blot" to illustrate how the United States was compromised, but not necessarily fatally, by slavery.[94] Other black abolitionists went even further. David F. Dorr, who toured Europe in the early 1850s with his master, wrote that his travels had shown him that the United States government "is destined to be the noblest fabric ever germinated in the brain of men or the tides of time."[95] The trope of the "aristocracy of race" had the potential to shame equality-loving Americans into appreciating how slavery and racism compromised their sense of place in the European world. Its effectiveness was diluted, however, by divisions in the antislavery movement over Britain and the depth of American sin, and because of the ambivalence of black abolitionists themselves. Nevertheless, the figure of the "aristocracy of race" was the most critical, and original, interpretation of the orientation of the United States in the Atlantic World to be developed by Americans before the Civil War.

Popular and academic historians alike often employ the term "exceptionalism" to describe how Americans thought about their relationship to the rest of the world.[96] Usually, American exceptionalism is meant to describe more than a sense of difference that distinguished the United States from other countries, for in that sense every nation is exceptional and the word ceases to have much meaning. Rather, American exceptionalism means that Americans thought of themselves both as different from and superior to other peoples. Some Americans before the Civil War certainly did define exceptionalism in this way. They believed that the United States was a promised land, the "city upon a hill" of John Winthrop's sermon, immunized from the contagions of the Old World and destined to chart a new course in human history. But in that sermon John Winthrop did not tell the passengers on the *Arbella* that they were walling themselves off from the Old World. Rather, he told them that "the eyes of all people are upon us." They were to be an example to the world, much as antebellum men and women saw themselves to be (and many Americans continue to believe).[97] There was an arrogance to that conviction, to be sure, but it also expressed a deeply cosmopolitan, fraternal spirit. Americans believed they were exceptional, but only in the sense that they institutionalized equality, freedom, and union *first*. Others were bound to follow. That conviction underlay travelers' responses to the 1848 Revolutions, their take on Anglo-Saxon culture, and their understanding of the meaning of the Union. This vision was flawed, as black abolitionists

ruthlessly pointed out. The Anglo-European world envisioned by American travelers was racist—aristocratic—at its core. It left no room for people of color. Antislavery travelers were asking much of their compatriots when they demanded they confront this flaw in their national character. White Americans could hardly envision a world without slavery and racism. Even abolitionists believed that success would come after many decades of hard struggle. They were right about the struggle, but wrong about the timeline. The "foul blot" of slavery would be gone sooner than anyone imagined, forcing travelers to reconfigure once again their nation's orientation to Europe.

Conclusion

Thinking about American identity before the Civil War requires situating the United States within European civilization. We should take our cue from transatlantic travelers, who insisted on doing so. Americans were receptive to European opinion on matters great and small. Antislavery travelers counted on that openness when they pleaded with European audiences to use their influence to counter the massive resources of the Slave Power. "Give us the power of your public opinion," Sarah Parker Remond begged a Manchester audience in 1859. "Words spoken here are read there as no words written in America are read." Robert Baird hearkened to that same sentiment when he called upon Americans to emulate the little kindnesses that Norwegians extended to one another in public spaces. "We are a rude people," Baird announced bluntly. Adopting Norwegian ways would have a "humanizing, a softening influence" that could only improve American national character. Although Baird's subject was less momentous than Remond's, they both shared the same conviction: the United States was part of a global community, but more specifically a European one, whose members had diverse talents. Americans could not afford to go it alone.[1]

Travelers like Remond and Baird led the campaign against the self-congratulatory variety of American exceptionalism epitomized by Harry McCall, whose observations from Rome opened this book. "*We are not of them*," he had lectured his cousin, though his very presence in Europe suggested otherwise. Most visitors certainly believed that the United States was superior to Europe in most respects. However, that conviction was highly qualified. Transatlantic Americans were eager to define the parameters of their national distinctiveness while affirming their membership in the European Atlantic World. The national identity that Americans developed in the decade before the Civil War—a unified people dedicated to representing liberalism around the globe—owed much to travelers' relentless advocacy of cosmopolitanism as a rebuke to

insularity and provincialism. Americans knew they stood "linked by a thousand ties to the popular sentiment of Europe," Francis Wayland explained in 1825. Wayland's vision was hardly free of smugness. He assumed that the United States would lead Europe, and then the world, into overthrowing secular and religious tyrannies. But Wayland was neither a romantic nor a jingoist. He told Americans that their leadership would cost them dearly in blood and treasure. And, in the end, they would achieve not an American empire but a "truly holy alliance"—all the peoples of the earth, "united in the pursuit of one object, the happiness of the whole."[2]

By 1861, Americans had come a long way from the anxious provincials who strove to embed themselves in the British Atlantic World. They had become less defensive about their orientation to the much older, established civilizations of Europe. Visitors were becoming comfortable with their ability to reconcile gentility with republicanism. It was possible, they realized, to embrace refinement without legitimating aristocracy. Travelers negotiated a similar rapprochement with Catholicism, despite the nativist sentiment that remained powerful in the United States. Appreciating Catholic art—even voicing respect for the rituals of the mass—did not imply endorsement of Church doctrine or the political machinations of the Vatican. While hardly broad-minded, this orientation to Roman Catholicism did compel travelers to reject the most illiberal nativist policies. Americans' attitude to England went through the most dramatic transformation. Americans still recognized John Bull as a potential rival, but the white-hot hatred for England so prevalent after the Revolution (though always less intense among the traveling population) had cooled into isolated pockets of Anglophobia. In its place a conception of Anglo-Saxon unity was emerging on both sides of the Atlantic. In the wake of the disappointments of 1848, travelers rejected the arguments of some Americans and Britons that continental peoples were unprepared for self-government. They had only contempt for the idea that some Europeans were racially fit only to be ruled, but never to rule themselves. Partly in response to the shocks of 1848, cosmopolitans developed a mature civic nationalism that defined the boundaries of American distinctiveness while maintaining the republic's commitment to the universal values of the Revolution of '76. As the Civil War loomed, traveled Americans had made much progress toward striking a balance between national exceptionalism and full participation in western European civilization. Cosmopolitan as that identity was, racism and national self-regard still marred it, as transatlantic abolitionists strove to point out.

European travel picked up again after Confederate armies laid down their arms in the spring of 1865. The Union's victory prompted Americans to reassess their relationship to Europe, and they reached some conclusions that would have displeased their antebellum forebears. Confederate defeat confirmed that the Union—more often now described as a nation— could survive a deadly internal threat. As a result, Americans went abroad far more confident in themselves vis-à-vis the nations of Europe than they ever had before. The popular nationalism that evolved during and after the war was skeptical that the United States had much to learn from the other side of the Atlantic. In 1842, Virginian Levin Smith Joynes judged the schools in Berne, Switzerland, to be far superior to their American counterparts. So much for being " 'the most intelligent people in the world,' as we are kindly informed on the Fourth of July," Joynes joked to his father. That inquiring, self-critical orientation took a beating from Northern victory in 1865. Less than a year after Lee's surrender, William Dean Howells wrote that American self-regard was "marvelously revivified" by a journey to Europe, which had little else to recommend it. The trip was worth taking just to learn that "the Fourth of July orations are true." That kind of complacent patriotism was more common to Howell's generation than to Joynes's.[3]

Americans abroad pushed their compatriots to see that Lee's surrender had transformed the standing of the United States in the community of nations. In the year following Appomattox, diplomats and travelers reinforced that message in a series of public celebrations on European soil. On July 4th, 1865 U.S. minister to France John Bigelow held a massive fête in Paris to celebrate the war's end and, more pointedly, to spell out its meaning for the reinvigorated nation's relationship with the Old World. James Harvey, U.S. minister to Portugal, told Bigelow that that Union victory vindicated Americans' long-standing belief that the United States provided "oppressed humanity everywhere the assurance of a home and a country." This was cosmopolitan nationalism, but of a newly confident and muscular variety. It was especially important that France, which had come close to recognizing the Confederacy, be made to understand that "the American people feel themselves equal to the fulfillment of their own destiny." *Galignani's Messenger,* the English-language Paris newspaper, estimated that between six and seven hundred Americans attended Bigelow's affair, which featured much eating, drinking, dancing, and patriotic tears. It culminated in the appearance of a massive eagle bearing a banner emblazoned with Webster's reply to Hayne: "The Union now and forever, one and inseparable."[4]

Four months later another gathering in Paris reaffirmed the confidence with which Union victory had endowed the United States. Americans there responded to President Johnson's call for a national day of Thanksgiving with a dinner at the Grand Hotel on December 7, 1865. The gathering gave Americans an opportunity to explain to Europeans—and, more importantly, to themselves—the global significance of the Union's survival. The doubts that had "troubled the world . . . and perhaps sometimes ourselves" about the future of republicanism had been wiped away. But Union victory affirmed more than American power. It demonstrated that the United States had come of age and was ready to assume its place in the community of nations. It was "at this centre of Europe," John Jay argued, that Americans could most clearly see how the war had elevated them "as a united people among the Powers of the earth." The disunionists' defeat did not enable Americans to disengage from Europe—much to the contrary. It gave them the "calm serenity" to pursue their national interest on their own terms, without deferring to the petty balance-of-power machinations of European diplomacy.[5]

As these rituals demonstrated, American self-assurance did not mean turning away from the Old World, although American travelers in the post–Civil War era were more certain than their predecessors that the United States had more to give than to receive from the exchange. As John Jay at the Paris Thanksgiving fête admitted, one far-reaching consequence of the Civil War was to put to rest Americans' own doubts about their Union. It did not create new national values but reaffirmed old ones.[6] Cleansed at last of the "foul stain" of chattel slavery, Americans could act without fear of hypocrisy on their millennial conviction that they had a duty to represent, and maybe even spread, liberty to the world. The older, more cooperative impulse did not disappear completely, however. Progressives eager to improve humankind—spreading self-government and Christianity, advancing science and medicine, and recognizing women's social value—still worked together across national boundaries. In the last decades of the century, reformers on both sides of the Atlantic came to understand that industrial capitalism caused problems that transcended national boundaries. They exchanged ideas and studied each other's initiatives, establishing a web of relationships and institutions devoted to establishing a transnational social politics.[7]

Most white Americans probably accepted much of what we know as the myth of American exceptionalism, but few travelers believed that the United States was somehow immune from the evils that plagued the Old World. Nor did Americans abroad think that Europe was too corrupt, too contaminated with superstition and tradition, to enjoy the blessings of liberty and equality. As the well-traveled American historian George Bancroft wrote in his *History of the*

United States (1882), the promise of the American Revolution shone brightly for "the entire world of mankind and all coming generations, without any exceptions whatsoever." Travelers' exposure to foreign societies made them resistant (though hardly immune) to the most inward-looking expressions of nationalism. The exceptionalism that so many visitors to Europe articulated was a profoundly cosmopolitan one. It situated the United States as simultaneously the teacher and the student of Europe. Their conviction that Americans would lead Europe toward a democratic, peaceful, and more egalitarian future strikes modern readers as arrogant. That it was, but it was also idealistic. When they visited Europe, Americans did not only encounter high civilization and cultivated society. They found despotic governments unaccountable to their people, a reactionary Catholic Church, and stifling economic policies that condemned most women and men to lives of hopeless poverty. The United States was hardly free from those and other vices, of course, and travelers' myopia on that score naturally inclines us to look critically on their easy assumption of moral superiority to Europe, as it should. But it might also be that Americans' idealism seems anachronistic to us not only for its contradictions and blind spots but because their faith in democracy, human rights, and progress seems naïve to a more cynical age. We ought to be open to the possibility that Bancroft and his transatlantic colleagues knew better.[8]

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

1. Harry McCall to Peter McCall, April 3, 1844 (Rome, England), July 15, 1844 (Paris), May 4, 1844 (Florence), January 24, 1844 (Greece, Constantinople), Peter McCall Papers, series 10, folder 3, Cadwalader Collection (Manuscripts Department, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia).

2. On the 1840s and early national figures, see Brandon Dupont, Alka Gandhi, and Thomas J. Weiss, "The American Invasion of Europe: The Long Term Rise in Overseas Travel, 1820–2000," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13977 (May 2008), 17–18 and table 1, p. 54. On estimates of colonial travelers, see Susan Lindsey Lively, "Going Home: Americans in Britain, 1740–1776" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1996), 5; and Julie M. Flavell and Gordon Hay, "Using Capture-Recapture Methods to Reconstruct the American Population in London," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32 (Summer 2001): 48.

3. Dupont et al. conclude that about 90% of Americans traveling abroad in 1850 visited Europe, and that figure is almost certainly higher for earlier periods. "American Invasion of Europe," 12.

4. Ibid., 17–18 and table 1, p. 54; on women, 10–11 and fig. 4, p. 43. See also Lynne Withey, *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel, 1750 to 1915* (New York: Willliam Morrow, 1997), 60–61. On the French figures, see Harvey Levenstein, *Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 22–23. See also the more impressionistic estimates given in Foster Rhea Dulles, *Americans Abroad: Two Centuries of European Travel* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964), 26–27, 43–44.

5. Raymond L. Cohn, "Transatlantic U.S. Passenger Travel at the Dawn of the Steamship Era," *International Journal of Maritime History* 4 (June 1992): 59; Dupont et al., "American Invasion of Europe," 6–8.

6. James Jackson Jarves, *Italian Sights and Papal Principles, Seen through American Spectacles* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1856), 346. On population, see Dupont et al., "American Invasion of Europe," 19–20; on fares, see Emory R. Johnson and Grover G. Huebner, *Principles of Ocean Transportation* (New York: Appleton, 1919), 335–37.

7. More detailed information about period-specific travel developments will be provided in the chapters.

8. [George P. Putnam], *The Tourist in Europe: A Concise Summary of the Various Routes, Objects of Interest . . .* (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1838), 61–63; see also Douglass C. North, "The United States Balance of Payments, 1790–1860," in *Trends in the American Economy in the Nineteenth Century: Studies in Income and Wealth*, ed. William N. Parker (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1960), 618–19; round-trip figures from Withey, *Grand Tours*, 62–63; income estimates from Robert A. Margo, *Wages and Labor Markets in the United States, 1820–1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), table 3A.7. On the rise in income, see Margo, *Wages and Labor Markets*; and Dupont et al., "American Invasion of Europe," 37.

9. Dulles, *Americans Abroad*, 27, notes that, of about 150 packet ships between 1815 and 1848, only 3 were lost at sea. On the safety of Atlantic commerce, see Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic, 1675–1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

10. Dulles, *Americans Abroad*, 26–27; Peter Stanford, "Steam and Speed, Part 1: How Steamships Paddled out of the Shallows into the Ocean World," *Sea History* 64 (Fall 1992): 12–14 (Junius Smith). See also Stephen Fox, *Transatlantic: Samuel Cunard, Isambard Brunel, and the Great Atlantic Steamships* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), chap. 1.

11. Edward W. Sloan III, "The Machine at Sea: Early Transatlantic Steam Travel," in *The Atlantic World of Robert G. Albion*, ed. Benjamin W. Larabee (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1975), 110–43; Fox, *Transatlantic*, chap. 2; Stanford, "Steam and Speed," 14; David Budlong Tyler, *Steam Conquers the Atlantic* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1939).

12. On guidebooks, see Dulles, *Americans Abroad*, chap. 6; [Putnam], *Tourist in Europe*; Roswell Park, *A Hand-Book for American Travellers in Europe, Collated from Best Authorities . . .*, 2 vols. (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1853); Mariana Starke, *Travels in Europe between the Years 1824 and 1828; Adapted to the Use of Travellers . . .*, 2 vols. (Leghorn: Glaucus Maci, 1828). Starke also published a more conventional guidebook, *Information and Directions for Travellers on the Continent*, 6th ed. (London: John Murray, 1828). Thomas Lee Shippen and James Rutledge Jr. used their valet to solicit the sexual favors of local women during their 1788 tour. Thomas Lee Shippen Diary, northern Italy vol., October 11, 1788, Shippen Family Papers (Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC).

13. Edwin J. Perkins, "Tourists and Bankers: Travelers' Credits and the Rise of American Tourism, 1840–1900," *Business and Economic History*, 2nd ser., 8 (1979): 16–28 (quotation on 17).

14. See the advice in [Putnam], *Tourist in Europe*, 25; Park, *Hand-Book for American Travellers*, 31–40; *Hand-Book for Travellers in Northern Italy . . .*, 2 vols., 7th ed. (London: John Murray, 1858), 1:xi–xii; 1:124 on Austria.

15. See "Outrage at 'Old Europe' Remarks," *BBC News World Edition*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2687403.stm, accessed March 23, 2011; William L. Vance, *America's Rome*, vol. 2, *Catholic and Contemporary Rome* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 109. See Webster's remarks in *American Magazine* 1 (May 1784): 370–74. On early

American culture, see Jill Lepore, *A Is for American: Letters and Other Characters in the Newly United States* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002); Joseph J. Ellis, *After the Revolution: Profiles of Early American Culture* (New York: Norton, 1979); C. Dallett Hemplill, *Bowing to Necessities: A History of Manners in America, 1620–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage, 1992).

16. Allan Nevins and Milton Halsey Thomas, eds., *The Diary of George Templeton Strong*, vol. 2, *The Turbulent Fifties, 1850–1859* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), 197; Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. Philips Bradley, 2 vols. (New York: Vintage Classics, 1990), 2:173.

17. For example, in Dulles, *Americans Abroad*; Cushing Strout, *The American Image of the Old World* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963); William W. Stowe, *Going Abroad: European Travel in Nineteenth-Century American Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); Larzer Ziff, *Return Passages: Great American Travel Writing, 1780–1910* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Christopher Mulvey, *Transatlantic Manners: Social Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Travel Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

18. Alexis Gregory, *The Golden Age of Travel, 1880–1939* (London: Cassell, 1998), 43–46; Christian Wolmar, *Blood, Iron, and Gold: How the Railroads Transformed the World* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2010), chaps. 5 and 6; Eric Hobsbawm, *The Age of Empire, 1875–1914* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1987), 9–10.

19. Fox, *Transatlantic*, chap. 10; N. R. P. Bonsor, *North Atlantic Seaway: An Illustrated History of the Passenger Services Linking the Old World with the New in Five Volumes*, rev. ed. (Jersey, Channel Islands: Brookside, 1975), 2:chap. 88; Levenstein, *Seductive Journey*, 125–30.

20. Levenstein, *Seductive Journey*, 129; see U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Historical Statistics of the United States from Colonial Times to 1970* (Washington, DC, 1976), 1:402; Dupont et al., "American Invasion of Europe," 17–20, table 1, p. 54.

Chapter 1 • "English association," 1750–1783

1. Benjamin Franklin to Peter Collinson, May 9, 1753, in Leonard W. Labaree et al., eds., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* (37 copies to date; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959–), 4:485–86. On the qualities of British identity, see Jack P. Greene, "Empire and Identity from the Glorious Revolution to the American Revolution," in *The Eighteenth Century*, vol. 2 of *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, ed. P. J. Marshall (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998–), 208–30.

2. William Smith, *An Eulogium, On the Delivery of Mr. Sargent's Prize-Medal . . .* , in *Four Dissertations, on the Reciprocal Advantages of a Perpetual Union Between Great-Britain and Her American Colonies* (Philadelphia: William and Thomas Bradford, 1766), 11; John Morgan, *Dissertation on the Reciprocal Advantages of a Perpetual Union Between Great-Britain and her American Colonies*, in ibid., 4–5.

3. Francis Hopkinson, *Dissertation IV*, in ibid., 108–9. Jack P. Greene, "Search for Identity: An Interpretation of the Meaning of Selected Patterns of Social Response in

Eighteenth-Century America," in Greene, *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 143–73; T. H. Breen, "Ideology and Nationalism on the Eve of the American Revolution: Revisions *Once More* in Need of Revising," *Journal of American History* 84 (June 1997): 13–39. The argument advanced here differs significantly from that in Jon Butler, *Becoming America: The Revolution before 1776* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

4. Samuel Powel to George Roberts, November 24, 1764, in "Powel-Roberts Correspondence," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 18 (1894): 40; Ralph Izard to Thomas Dea, January 17, 1775, in Anne Izard Deas, ed., *Correspondence of Mr. Ralph Izard, of South Carolina, from the Year 1774 to 1804; with a Short Memoir* (New York: Charles S. Francis, 1844), 39.

5. Michelle Cohen, "The Grand Tour: Constructing the English Gentleman in Eighteenth-Century France," *History of Education* [Great Britain] 21 (1992): 241–57; Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 316–20; Geoffrey Trease, *The Grand Tour* (London: Heinemann, 1967); Christopher Hibbert, *The Grand Tour* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1969); John Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad, 1604–1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics*, rev. ed. (1952; repr., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

6. Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992).

7. Jonathan Belcher, "Journal of my Intended Voyage, & Journey to Holland, Hanover, etc." (Manuscripts Department, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, n.d.), 52–53; Charley Carroll to Charles Carroll of Annapolis, July 2, 1763, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Family Papers [microfilm copy] (Special Collections, Maryland State Archives); James Logan to Isaac Gale, December 10, 1720, vol. 2, James Logan Letterbooks (Manuscripts Department, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia), 229–31. I thank James Smolenski for bringing this source to my attention.

8. Ezra Stiles to Benjamin Franklin, June 25, 1771, Henry Marchant Papers (Rhode Island Historical Society, Providence). On Chesterfield, see Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 36–37, 191; C. Dallett Hemphill, *Bowing to Necessities: A History of Manners in America, 1620–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Michal J. Rozbicki, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998), 144–45.

9. Carl Bridenbaugh, ed., *Gentleman's Progress: The Itinerarium of Dr. Alexander Hamilton, 1744* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1948), 185–86; Edward Shippen to Joseph Shippen Jr., October 9, 1749, vol. 1, Balch-Shippen Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania), 24; Jonathan Clarke to John S. Copley, December 20, 1772, in *Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley and Henry Pelham, 1739–1776*, Massachusetts Historical Society *Collections* 71 (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1914): 192.

10. James B. Bell, "Anglican Clergy in Colonial America Ordained by Bishops of London," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, n.s., 83 (1973): 103–60.

11. Whitfield J. Bell Jr., "Philadelphia Medical Students in Europe, 1750–1800," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 67 (January 1943): 1–29; Samuel Lewis, "List of the American Graduates in Medicine at the University of Edinburgh, from 1705 to 1866, with their Theses," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* 42 (1888): 159–65; E. Alfred Jones, *American Members of the Inns of Court* (London: St. Catherine, 1924); John M. Murrin, "The Legal Transformation: The Bench and Bar of Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts," in *Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development*, 3rd ed., ed. Stanley N. Katz and John M. Murrin (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1983), 540–72.

12. Willard Connely, "List of Colonial Americans at Oxford and Cambridge," *American Oxonian* 29 (1942): 6–17; 75–77; Julie M. Flavell, "The 'School for Modesty and Humility': Colonial American Youth in London and Their Parents, 1755–1775," *Historical Journal* 42 (1999): 377–403; William L. Sachse, *The Colonial American in Britain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956); Michael Kraus, *The Atlantic Civilization: Eighteenth-Century Origins* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1949), 65–94.

13. Thomas M. Doerflinger, *A Vigorous Spirit of Enterprise: Merchants and Economic Development in Revolutionary Philadelphia* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1987), 49; Rebecca Starr, *A School for Politics: Commercial Lobbying and Political Culture in Early South Carolina* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988).

14. Henry Laurens to John Laurens, October 26, 1773, in *The Papers of Henry Laurens*, 16 vols., ed. Philip M. Hamer et al. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1968–2002), 9:134. For a general overview of the reasons colonials visited Britain, see Susan L. Lively, "Going Home: Americans in Britain, 1740–1776" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1996), 37–52.

15. Gabriel Manigault to Ann Manigault, December 21, 1777, Manigault Family Papers (Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia); William Allen to D. Barclay & Sons, March 10, 1750, in *Extracts from Chief Justice William Allen's Letter Book*, vol. 1 of *The Burd Papers*, ed. Lewis Burd Walker (Pottsville, PA: Standard, 1897), 38; E. P. Richardson, "West's Voyage to Italy, 1760, and William Allen," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 102 (January 1978): 3–26; Thomas Gilpin Jr., "Memoir of Thomas Gilpin," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 49 (1925): 293.

16. Charles Pinckney Rent Roll, 1753, Benjamin Huger Rutledge Papers (Manuscript Department, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston); Charley Carroll to Charles Carroll, July 2, 1763, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Family Papers; Richard Ambler to Edward Ambler, February 28, 1752, in Lucille Griffith, ed., "English Education for Virginia Youth: Some Eighteenth-Century Ambler Family Letters," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 69 (January 1961): 24.

17. Ebenezer Pemberton, *Advice to a Son: A Discourse at the Request of a Gentleman in New-England upon his Son's going to Europe . . .* (London: Ralph Smith, 1705), 12. Douglas Hurd, *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel; Considered as a Part of an English Gentleman's Education: Between Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Locke* (London: printed for W. B. for A. Millar, 1764), was a popular English critique of the Grand Tour.

18. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, April 4, 1765; Douglass Adair, ed., "The Autobiography of the Reverend Devereux Jarratt, 1732–1763," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 9 (July

1952): 383–84; Nicholas B. Wainwright, ed., "Voyage to England, 1763–1764," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 73 (January 1949): 89–90.

19. William Strahan to Deborah Franklin, December 13, 1757, in *Franklin Papers*, ed. Labaree and Ketcham, 7:296; Gabriel Manigault Journal, September 16, 1777, Manigault Family Papers. On the regularity of trans-oceanic travel, see Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic, 1675–1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

20. "The fact that travelers had to cross an ocean even to get to the mother country set them apart from other British provincials," explains Susan Lively in "Going Home," 138.

21. Richard Ambler to Edward Ambler, February 28, 1752, in Griffith, "English Education for Virginia Youth," 24; Francis Hopkinson to Mary Johnson Hopkinson, July 2, 1766, August 4, 1776, in George Everett Hastings, *The Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1926), 129, 132–33.

22. Greene, "Empire and Identity."

23. Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 54; Eliga H. Gould, *The Persistence of Empire: British Political Culture in the Age of the American Revolution* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2000), 20; Jon Butler, *Awash in a Sea of Faith: Christianizing the American People* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 104–5; John M. Murrin, "Anglicizing an American Colony: The Transformation of Provincial Massachusetts" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1966), chap. 2.

24. *The Journal of Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia from the City of Rome to the City of London, 1764, with a Fragment of a Journal Written at Rome, 1764, and a Biographical Sketch* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1907), 71; Martha C. Codman, ed., *The Journal of Mrs. John Amory (Katherine Greene) 1775–1777, With Letters from her Father, Rufus Greene 1759–1777* (Boston: privately printed, 1923), 26; "Diary of Joseph Shippen in Europe," July 15, 1760 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Benjamin Rush, "Account of a Journey to Paris, 1769" (Literary and Historical Manuscripts, Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, n.d.), 14. On colonial anti-Catholicism, see Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688–1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of American History and Culture, 2006); John Patrick Barrington, "Studies in the Anti-Catholic Origins of the Anglo-American Self" (PhD diss., College of William and Mary, 1997); Joseph J. Casino, "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 105 (July 1981): 279–310.

25. Francis Hopkinson to Mary Johnson Hopkinson, July 2, 1766, in Hastings, *Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson*, 129; Samuel Powel Diary, July 11, 1761 (Powel House, Philadelphia); Henry Laurens Travel Journal, in *Laurens Papers*, ed. Hamer et al., 8:385; Joseph Shippen Diary, August 4, 1760.

26. Codman, *Journal of Mrs. John Amory*, 4; William L. Sachse, "The Journal of Nathan Prince, 1747," *American Neptune* 16 (1956): 86.

27. Greene, "Empire and Identity," 215.

28. Thomas Parke, "Journal of a Voyage from Philadelphia to London," July 15, 1771, Pemberton Family Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Manigault, "Journey

from London tro' Uxbridge, Oxford, Woodstock . . . & on to Birmingham," August 28, 1779, Manigault Family Papers. On colonials as consumers of British goods, see T. H. Breen, "Baubles of Britain: The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 119 (May 1988): 73–104; Breen, "An Empire of Goods: The Anglicization of Colonial America, 1690–1776," *Journal of British Studies* 25 (October 1986): 467–99; and Cary Carson, Ronald Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert, eds., *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia for the United States Capitol Historical Society, 1994).

29. Henry Drinker Diary, October 15, 1759 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); John London, "Journal from Bristol to Bromsgrove in Worcestershire" (n.d.), 4, 11–12; James London Scottish Journal, September 24, 1776, London Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill); Francis Kinloch to Gabriel Manigault, March 30, 1778, Manigault Family Papers; William Robertson Diary, n.d. (March–August 1771), June 20, 1771 (Virginia Historical Society, Richmond). On anti-Scottish prejudice, see Andrew Hook, *Scotland and America: A Study of Cultural Relations, 1750–1835* (Glasgow: Blackie, 1975).

30. Rush, "Account of a Journey to Paris," 1; George W. Corner, ed., *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush: His "Travels through Life" Together with His Commonplace Book for 1789–1813*, *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 25 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1948), 73 (Indians).

31. Gabriel Manigault to Ann Manigault, October 25, 1775, Manigault Family Papers; Henry Laurens Travel Journal, April 27, 1773, in *Laurens Papers*, ed. Hamer et al., 9:18. The increasing tolerance of British travelers is detailed in Heinz-Joachim Müllenbrock, "The Political Implications of the Grand Tour: Aspects of a Specifically English Contribution to the European Travel Literature of the Age of Enlightenment," *Trema* 9 (1984): 7–21; and Black, *British Abroad*, 213–37. On Britain's increasingly blue-water orientation, see Gould, *Persistence of Empire*, 35–71; Eric Hinderaker, "The 'Four Indian Kings' and the Imaginative Construction of the First British Empire," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 53 (July 1996): 487–526.

32. Wainwright, "Voyage to England," 90–91; Joseph Shippen Diary, August 5, 7, 1760; *Journal of Dr. John Morgan*, 71; Arthur Young, *Travels During the Years 1787, 1788, and 1789*, 2 vols. (London: Bury St. Edmonds, 1792), 1:85.

33. Gabriel Manigault to Ann Manigault, December 21, 1777, Manigault Family Papers; Samuel Powel Diary, July 12, 1761.

34. Palfrey quoted in Lively, "Going Home," 133; Benjamin Pickman to Polly Pickman, November 10, 1780, in George Francis Dow, ed., *The Diary and Letters of Benjamin Pickman (1740–1819) of Salem, Massachusetts* . . . (Newport, RI: privately printed, 1928), 118; "Journal of Josiah Quincy, Jun., During his Voyage and Residence in England from September 28th, 1774, to March 3rd, 1775," Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings* 50 (October 1916–June 1917): 437.

35. Joseph Shippen Diary, August 19, 1760; Gabriel Manigault Journal, July 15, 1778; *Journal of Dr. John Morgan*, 223–24; Henry Laurens Travel Journal, April 25, 1773, in *Laurens Papers*, ed. Hamer et al., 9:17.

36. Codman, *Journal of Mrs. John Amory*, 7; John London, "Journal," 6; Isaac Smith to William Smith, February 7, 1771, Smith-Carter Family Papers (Massachusetts Historical Society); "Journal of Josiah Quincy," 434.

37. John Macpherson Jr. to Will McPhereson, September 30, 1771, in William MacPherson Hornor, comp., "Extracts from the Letters of John Macpherson, Jr., to William Patterson, 1766–1773," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 23 (1899): 58; William Robertson Diary, June 7, 1771; Ralph Izard to George Demptser, January 21, 1775, in Deas, *Correspondence of Mr. Ralph Izard*, 43.

38. Richard Ambler to Edward Ambler, February 28, 1752, in Griffith, "English Education for Virginia Youth," 25; William Robertson Diary, June 6, 1771; "Journal of Josiah Quincy," 436.

39. Harriott Horry Ravenel, *Eliza Pinckney* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), 144; Samuel Powel to George Roberts, September 1, 1763, in "Powel-Roberts Correspondence," 37; Shelia L. Skemp, *William Franklin: Son of a Patriot, Servant of a King* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); John Dickinson to Mary Cadwalader Dickinson, February 19, 1755, in H. Trevor Colbourn, ed., "A Pennsylvania Farmer at the Court of King George: John Dickinson's London Letters, 1754–1756," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 86 (October 1962): 429.

40. Francis Hopkinson to Mary Hopkinson, March 9, 1767, in Hastings, *Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson*, 144; William Lowndes Diary, January 6, 1755, box 2, folder 5, William Lowndes Papers (Southern Historical Collection); Morgan quoted in Betsy Copping Corner, *William Shippen, Jr.: Pioneer in American Medical Education, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 28 (1951): 92.

41. Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charley Carroll, June 29, 1762, in Ronald Hoffman, ed., *Dear Papa, Dear Charley: The Peregrinations of a Revolutionary Aristocrat . . .* , 3 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2001), 1:261; Benjamin Rush to Ebenezer Hazard, October 22, 1768, in L. H. Butterfield, ed., *Letters of Benjamin Rush*, vol. 1, *1761–1792, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 30 (1951): 68. On esteem for the monarchy in the colonies, see Gordon S. Wood, *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), pt. 1; Richard L. Bushman, *King and People in Provincial Massachusetts* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1985); and, for a very forceful statement, McConville, *King's Three Faces*.

42. G. W. Corner, ed., *Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, 58; Henry Laurens Travel Journal, June 30, 1772, in *Laurens Papers*, ed. Hamer et al., 8:385; Wainwright, "Voyage to England," 91.

43. Rush, "Account of a Journey to Paris," 25, 27; John S. Copley to Susan Copley, September 15, 1774, John S. Copley Papers (Manuscript Department, Library of Congress, Washington, DC); Ralph Izard to Thomas Dea, in Deas, *Correspondence of Mr. Ralph Izard*, 40; John Dickinson to Samuel Dickinson, August 12, 1755, in Colbourn, "John Dickinson's London Letters," 433.

44. Hopkinson to Mary Johnson Hopkinson, March 9, 1766, in Hastings, *Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson*, 144–45; Parke quoted in W. J. Bell, "Philadelphia Medical

Students," 22–23; Allen quoted in Flavell, "'School for Modesty and Humility,'" 391; Ebenezer Hazard, "Reflections after Return from Europe" (Historical Society of Pennsylvania, n.d. [1771]).

45. Robert Hunter Morris Diary, July 20, 1735, in Beverly McAnear, ed., "An American in London, 1735–36," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 64 (April 1940): 215; entry for December 31, 1753, in George William Pilcher, ed., *The Reverend Samuel Davies Abroad: The Diary of a Journey to England and Scotland, 1753–55* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967), 46; "Journal of Josiah Quincy," 435.

46. Samson Occom Diary, February 20, 1765, in Leon Burr Richardson, ed., *An Indian Preacher in England: Being Letters and Diaries Relating to the Mission of the Reverend Samson Occom and the Reverend Nathaniel Whitaker . . .* , Dartmouth College Manuscript Series No. 2 (Hanover, NH: Dartmouth College Publications, 1933), 84–85; Thomas Coombe Jr. to Sally Coombe, January 28, 1769, folder 16, Thomas Coombe Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); William Allen to Benjamin Chew, October 7, 1763, in David A. Kimball and Miriam Quinn, eds., "William Allen-Benjamin Chew Correspondence, 1763–1764," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 90 (April 1966): 212; Chew quoted in Lively, "Going Home," 132.

47. Thomas Ruston to Job Ruston, March 10, 1764, Thomas Ruston Papers (Library of Congress).

48. Dickinson to "Honored Father," January 21, 1755; to "Honourd Mother," June 6, 1756, in Colbourn, "John Dickinson's London Letters," 421, 449.

49. Codman, *Journal of Mrs. John Amory*, 30; Rush, "Account of a Journey to Paris," 3–4; John S. Copley to Susan Copley, September 15, 1774, in *Copley-Pelham Letters*, 258; Joseph Shippen Diary, July 23, 1760.

50. Jared Ingersoll to William Samuel Johnson, December 22, 1759, in E. Edwards Beardsley, *Life and Times of William Samuel Johnson, LL.D., First Senator in Congress from Connecticut, and President of Columbia College, New York* (New York: Hurd and Huntington, 1876), 19; William Allen to Benjamin Chew, January 27, 1764, in "Allen-Chew Correspondence," 220–21; "Journal of Josiah Quincy," November 8 and 9, 1774, 434–35; "A Few Extracts from E[lizabeth] G[raeme]'s Journal," in Catherine La Courreye Blecki and Karin A. Wulf, eds., *Milcah Martha Moore's Book: A Commonplace Book from Revolutionary America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997), 203.

51. John M. Murrin, "A Roof without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity," in *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity*, ed. Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter II (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of American History and Culture, 1987), 340.

52. William Robertson Diary, April 21, 22, 1771; Whitfield J. Bell Jr., *John Morgan: Continental Doctor* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1965), 85; on Morgan's party, see Arthur S. Marks, "Angelica Kaufmann and Some Americans on the Grand Tour," *American Art Journal* 12 (Spring 1980): 11, 21.

53. Maurie McInnis, *In Pursuit of Refinement: Charlestonians Abroad, 1740–1860* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), 100; Dickinson to mother, February 19, 1755, in Colbourn, "John Dickinson's London Letters," 428.

54. Charles Lowndes Diary, November 13, 1754, November 4, 1754.

55. On gambling debts, ibid., November 2, 1754, and passim; on bail, October 26, 1754.

56. Ibid., December 14, 1754.

57. Ibid., December 7, 1754.

58. Eliza L. Pinckney to Ann Manigault, December 1753–January 1754, in Elise Pinckney, ed., *The Letterbook of Eliza Lucas Pinckney 1739–1762* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 80; Johnson to [?], September 12, 1767, William Samuel Johnson Papers (Historical Manuscripts, Connecticut Historical Society, Hartford); Joseph Shippen Diary, August 6, 1759, in B. C. Corner, *William Shippen, Jr.*, 15.

59. G. W. Corner, *Autobiography of Benjamin Rush*, 46; Rush, "Account of a Journey to Paris," 7.

60. William Allen to Benjamin Chew, April 13, 1764, in Kimball and Quinn, "Allen-Chew Correspondence," 224–25.

61. William Shippen Diary, November 22, December 9, 1759, in B. C. Corner, *William Shippen, Jr.*, 29, 30; Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, September 23, 1751, July 2, 1753, in Mabel L. Weber, ed., "Peter Manigault's Letters," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 32 (January 1931): 47, 52.

62. John London Diary, July 30, 1776; Gabriel Manigault Diary, October 21, 1777; William Robertson Diary, June 4, 1771.

63. George C. Preachy, ed., "Two Unpublished Letters of Matthew Baillie, M.D.," *Annals of Medical History*, n.s., 3 (1931): 405. For these attitudes, see Stephen Conway, "From Fellow-Nationals to Foreigners: British Perceptions of the Americans, circa 1739–1783," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 59 (January 2002): 65–100; Kraus, *Atlantic Civilization*, 217–19. West Indians were particularly caricatured as money-grubbing sadists. See Andrew Jackson O'Shaughnessy, *An Empire Divided: The American Revolution and the British Caribbean* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), 11–12. Sometimes, these questions were not as off the mark as colonials liked to believe. Thomas Ringgold, writing from Maryland in 1756, affirmed James Hollyday's decision to continue his studies at the Inns of Court, writing, "Your resolution is prudent for another reason, you are out of the continual fears and alarms we undergo here on account of the Indians." Ringgold to Hollyday, April 30, 1756, in George T. Hollyday, "Biographical Memoir of James Hollyday," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 7 (1883): 436.

64. Frederick A. Pottle, ed., *Boswell in Holland, 1763–1764, Including His Correspondence with Belle de Zuylen* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), 10–11; William Allen to Benjamin Chew, October 6, 1763, in Kimball and Quinn, "Allen-Chew Correspondence," 214.

65. *Journal of Dr. John Morgan*, 167, 170.

66. Ibid., 116–17.

67. Ibid., 181–82.

68. Ibid., 185–86, 192, 194; Powel to George Roberts, November 24, 1764, "Powel-Roberts Correspondence," 40.

69. Charles Carroll to Charley Carroll, January 1, 1758, in Hoffman, *Dear Papa, Dear Charley*, 1:58.

70. Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 32 (April 1931), 130 (to Ann Manigault, May 9, 1753), 33 (January 1932), 59 (to Ann Manigault, April 26, 1754), 32 (January 1931), 59 (to Ann Manigault, n.d. [November–December 1752]), 32 (July 1931), 183 (to Gabriel Manigault, August 18, 1753), 31 (July 1930), 176 (to Ann Manigault, August 2, 1750).

71. Francis Hopkinson to Mary J. Hopkinson, January 24, 1767, in Hastings, *Life and Works of Francis Hopkinson*, 141; Dickinson to mother, February 19, 1755, in Colbourn, "John Dickinson's London Letters," 428–29; Sophia Penn to Margaret Manigault, November 30, 1784, Manigault Family Papers; "Elizabeth Graeme's Journal," in Blecki and Wulf, *Milcah Martha Moore's Book*, 206–7.

72. John Moultrie to "Hond. Father," September 29, 1746, in "Letters of a Colonial Student of Medicine in Edinburgh to His Parents in South Carolina, 1746–1749," *University of Edinburgh Journal* 4 (1930–31): 273; Charley Carroll to Charles Carroll, December 8, 1763, in Hoffman, *Dear Papa, Dear Charley*, 1:340.

73. Benjamin to Polly Pickman, May 13, 1775, in Dow, *Diary and Letters of Benjamin Pickman*, 92–93; "Elizabeth Graeme's Journal," in Blecki and Wulf, *Milcah Martha Moore's Book*, 203; Charles Lowndes Journal, February 6, 1755.

74. Georges A. Bonnard, ed., *Gibbon's Journey from Geneva to Rome: His Journal from 20 April to 2 October 1764* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1961), 257; John S. Copley to Henry Pelham, September 25, 1774; Copley to Mother, June 25, 1775, in *Letters and Papers of John Singleton Copley*, 262, 329; Marks, "Angelica Kaufmann," 10; "Observations of a Traveller, on a Tour through Holland, Flanders, France, & Italia" (South Carolina Historical Society, n.d.), n.p.

75. Breen, "Baubles of Britain"; Breen, "The Meaning of Things: Interpreting the Consumer Economy in the Eighteenth Century," in *Consumption and the World of Goods*, ed. John Brewer and Roy Porter (London: Routledge, 1993), 249–60; Cary Carson, "The Consumer Revolution in Colonial British America: Why Demand?," in *Of Consuming Interests*, ed. Carson et al., 483–697, esp. 688–89 regarding colonial cultural aspirations: "The British part was taken for granted. Being a *civilized* Briton was something else."

76. *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 4, 1754.

77. Robert C. Smith, "Eighteenth-Century Americans on the Grand Tour," *Antiques* 58 (October 1955): 345.

78. *Journal of Dr. John Morgan*, 239–43; Francois-Jean, Marquis de Chastellux, *Travels in North America in the Years 1780, 1781, and 1792*, 2 vols., trans. Howard C. Rice (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1963), 1:302; Joseph Shippen Diary, n.d. (expenses listed in the back); William Allen to David Barclay & Sons, April 5, 1760; May 19, 1760, in E. P. Richardson, "West's Voyage to Italy," 10, 13.

79. David L. Barquist, " 'The Honours of a Court' or 'the Severity of Virtue': Household Furnishings and Cultural Aspirations in Philadelphia," in *Shaping a National Culture: The Philadelphia Experience, 1750–1800*, ed. Catherine E. Hutchins (Winterthur, DE: Henry Francis de Pont Winterthur Museum, 1994), 314, 322; George Roberts to Samuel Powel, November 5, 1763, "Powel-Roberts Correspondence," 37.

80. Morrison H. Heckscher, "Philadelphia Furniture, 1760–90: Native-Born and London-Trained Craftsmen," in *The American Craftsman and the European Tradition,*

1620–1820, ed. Francis J. Puig and Michael Conforti (Minneapolis: Minneapolis Institute of Arts, 1989), 92–111; Kevin M. Sweeney, "High-Style Vernacular: Lifestyles of the Colonial Elite," in *Of Consuming Interests*, ed. Carson et al., 1–58; on Cadwalader, see Nicholas B. Wainwright, *Colonial Grandeur in Philadelphia: The House and Furniture of General John Cadwalader* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1964).

81. McInnis, *In Pursuit of Refinement*, 248–50, 260–62.

82. Angela D. Mack and J. Thomas Savage, "Reflections of Refinement: Portraits of Charlestonians at Home and Abroad," in McInnis, *In Pursuit of Refinement*, 23–38.

83. Charles Carroll to Charley Carroll, September 2, 1762, in Hoffman, *Dear Papa, Dear Charley*, 1:278.

84. Anthony M. Clark, *Pompeo Batoni: A Complete Catalogue of His Works, with an Introductory Text*, ed. Edgar Peters Brown (New York: New York University Press, 1985); Edgar Peters Bowron, *Pompeo Batoni and His British Patrons* (London: Greater London Council, 1982); Aileen Riberio, *The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France, 1750–1820* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995).

85. Marks, "Angelica Kauffmann," 12–17.

86. Karin Calvert, "The Function of Fashion in Eighteenth-Century America," in *Of Consuming Interests*, ed. Carson et al., 252–83.

87. Mack and Savage, "Reflections of Refinement," 118; for a detailed exegesis, see Maurie McInnis, "Cultural Politics, Colonial Crisis, and Ancient Metaphor in John Singleton Copley's *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard*," *Winterthur Portfolio* 34 (Summer–Autumn 1999): 85–108.

88. John Moultrie to "Hon'd Father," September 29, 1746, in "Letters from a Colonial Student," 272; Allen to D. Barclay & Sons, April 12, 1762, in Walker, *Extracts from Chief Justice William Allen's Letter Book*, 50; Charles Lowndes Diary, October 15–25, 1754.

89. John Marscarene to Margaret H. Marscarene, October 17, 1761; Elizabeth Murray to James and Margaret Murray, November [16], 1769, both quoted in Lively, "Going Home," 153; Charles Lowndes Diary, November 16, 23, December 13, November 21 (Cato), November 3 (wig), October 10, 1754; Preston and Griffitts quoted in W. J. Bell, "Philadelphia Medical Students," 7.

90. Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, March 13, 1752, in "Six Letters of Peter Manigault," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 15 (July 1914): 121; Peter Manigault to Ann Manigault, May 9, 1753, in Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 129.

91. Peter Manigault to Ann Manigault, August 2, 1750, February 20, 1750, in Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 174, 270; McInnis, *In Pursuit of Refinement*, 286, 261; Robert Dodsley, *The Oeconomy of Human Life: Translated from an Indian Manuscript Written by an Ancient Bramin* (London: M. Cooper, 1751).

92. Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, January 23, 1750, to Ann Manigault, April 15, 1751, in Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 270, 278. On the Smiths' portraits, see McInnis, *In Pursuit of Refinement*, 94; on Manigault's portrait, see Mack and Savage, "Reflections of Refinement," 25–26.

93. Peter Manigault to Ann Manigault, February 20, 1750, in Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 271–72; Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, August 1, 1750, in "Six Letters," 118.

94. Peter Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, September 23, 1751; to Ann Manigault, March 12, 1750, April 15, 1751, and fragment, in Weber, "Peter Manigault's Letters," 47–48, 274, 276, 176 (last quotation); to Ann Manigault, July 4, 1750, in "Six Letters," 117 ("my native country").

95. Robert Patterson, ed., *A Plain Elementary and Practical System of Natural Experimental Philosophy; Including Anatomy and Chronology, by the Late Rev. John Ewing, D.D. . . .* (Philadelphia: Hopkins and Earle, 1809), xvii; Martha C. Slotten, "Elizabeth Graeme Ferguson: A Poet in 'The Athens of North America,'" *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, July 1984, 259–88; Anne Hollingsworth Wharton, *Salons Colonial and Republican* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1900), 19.

Chapter 2 • "The blows my republican principles receive are forcible," 1783–1820

1. Walter A. McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State: The American Encounter with the World since 1776* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), chaps. 1 and 2.

2. John M. Murrin, "A Roof without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity," in *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity*, ed. Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter II (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1987), 333–48.

3. Winslow C. Watson, ed., *Men and Times of the Revolution: or, Memoirs of Elkanah Watson, Including Journals of Travels in Europe and America, from 1777 to 1842, with His Correspondence with Public Men and Reminiscences and Incidents of the Revolution* (New York: Dana, 1856), 146–47.

4. John Adams to Elkanah Watson, April 30, 1780, in *The Papers of John Adams, Series III: General Correspondence and Other Papers of the Adams Statesmen*, 15 vols. to date, ed. Robert J. Taylor et al. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977–), 9:256–57. See also Richard A. Ryerson, "John Adams in Europe: A Provincial Cosmopolitan Confronts the Metropolitan World, 1778–1788," in *Old World, New World: America and Europe in the Age of Jefferson*, ed. Leonard J. Sadosky et al. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 131–54.

5. Jefferson to John Banister Jr., October 15, 1785, in *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 36 vols. to date, ed. Julian P. Boyd (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1950–), 8:636–37. On Jefferson in Europe, see William Howard Adams, *The Paris Years of Thomas Jefferson* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997).

6. Jefferson to William Shippen, May 8, 1788, in *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 13:146; "Jefferson's Hints to Americans Travelling in Europe," in *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 13:269.

7. Maria Edgeworth to [John Griscom], March 4, 1824, folder 82, Henry Lyman Koopman Collection (Manuscripts Department, Hay Library, Brown University, Providence, RI). Edgeworth addressed the letter to the author of *Travels in Europe*, but internal evidence reveals Griscom to be the addressee.

8. Eran Shalev, "Empire Transformed: Britain in the American Classical Imagination, 1758–1783," *Early American Studies* 4 (Spring 2006): 112–46; Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished*

Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010).

9. John M. Murrin, "Escaping Perfidious Albion: Federalism, Fear of Aristocracy, and the Democratization of Corruption in Postrevolutionary America," in *Virtue, Corruption, and Self-Interest: Political Values in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. Richard K. Matthews (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh University Press, 1994), 126. See also Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Ronald L. Hatzenbuehler and Robert L. Ivie, *Congress Declares War: Rhetoric, Leadership, and Partisanship in the Early Republic* (Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 1983); Andrew W. Robinson, "'Look on this Picture . . . and on This!': Nationalism, Localism, and Partisan Images of Otherness in the United States, 1787–1820," *American Historical Review* 106 (October 2001): 1263–80; Mathew Rainbow Hale, "'Many who wandered in darkness': The Contest over American National Identity, 1795–1798," *Early American Studies* 1 (Spring 2003): 127–75.

10. Anthony Mann, "'A Nation first in all the arts of civilisation': Boston's Post-Revolutionary Elites View Great Britain," *American Nineteenth-Century History* 2 (Summer 2001): 1–34; Tamara Plakins Thornton, *Cultivating Gentlemen: The Meaning of Country Life among the Boston Elite, 1785–1860* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 39.

11. Adams quoted in Bradford Perkins, *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, vol. 1, *The Creation of a Republican Empire, 1776–1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 205.

12. Joseph Eaton, "From Anglophile to Nationalist: Robert Walsh's *An Appeal from the Judgments of Great Britain*," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 132 (April 2008): 160–61; Jennifer Clark, "The War of 1812: American Nationalism and Rhetorical Images of Britain," *War and Society* 12 (May 1994): 4–5.

13. James West to William West, August 23, 1810, box 1, folder 1, West Family Papers (Manuscripts Department, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia); John Brown Cutting to Rutledge, July 5, 1790, John Rutledge Jr. Papers (Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).

14. Eliza Buckminster Lee, ed., *Memoirs of Rev. Joseph Buckminster, D.D., and of his Son, Rev. Joseph Stevens Buckminster*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1851), 269; *Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor*, 2 vols. (Boston: James B. Osgood, 1876), 1:150. In *Coming to Terms with Democracy: Federalist Intellectuals and the Shaping of an American Culture* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), Marshall Foletta argues that the generations of Buckminster and Ticknor experienced an "alienation of cultural sympathies" and a "reorientation of affection" toward the United States and against England as a result of what Alexander Everett called the "continual sneers of a set of heartless and senseless foreigners upon our want of literary talent" (81). Although young Federalists were certainly less Anglophilic than their elders, this was a relative, not absolute, decline; "alienation" seems too strong a word to describe their orientation toward England, which might better be characterized as an ambivalent Anglophilia. These New Englanders took a more nationalistic view of the Anglo-American relationship, but they were committed to reestablishing it on that more egalitarian foundation.

For other views stressing New Englanders' lingering admiration for English culture, see Mann, "'Nation first in all the arts of civilisation'"; and Thornton, *Cultivating Gentlemen*.

15. James Oldden Jr. Diary, September 17, 1800 [pp. 183–84] (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Francis Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France, Written During a Residence of Between Two and Three Years, in Different Parts of those Countries, and Addressed to a Lady in Virginia*, 2 vols. (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1819), 1:470, 1:36.

16. "Literary Intelligence," *Portico* 4, no. 6 (December 1817): 504.

17. Watson, *Men and Times of the Revolution*, 143; Mordecai Manuel Noah, *Travels in England, France, Spain, and the Barbary States, in the Years 1813–14 and 15* (New York: Kirk and Mercein, 1819), 58, 36.

18. Vernon F. Snow, ed., "The Grand Tour Diary of Robert C. Johnson, 1792–1793," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 102 (February 1958): 72 (love), 74 (Bristol), 75 (London), 79 (order), 76 (courts), 80 (exalted); Andrew Bigelow Diary, octavo vol. 4, February 25, 1817, Andrew Bigelow Papers (Manuscripts Department, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, MA).

19. John Frere to John Baylor, Marcy 1, 1796; William Bond to John Baylor, August 17, 1793 (harmony), box 1, Papers of the Baylor Family (Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library, University of Virginia, Charlottesville).

20. Andrew Leslie to Jane I. Leslie, August 6, 1819, December 28, 1820 (education), Gordon Blair Papers (Virginia Historical Society, Richmond).

21. George Watson to David Watson, July 16, 1806, section 1, folder 1, Watson Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Benjamin Silliman, *A Journal of Travels in England, Holland and Scotland, and of Two Passages over the Atlantic, in the years 1805 and 1806*, 2 vols. (New York: D. and G. Bruce, 1810), 2:337–38.

22. Minnie Clare Yarborough, ed., *The Reminiscences of William C. Preston* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933), 46–47 (Scot), 34 (England); Bigelow Diary, octavo vol. 3, December 27, 28, 1816. David Stewart Erskine, Earl of Buchan, *Address to the Americans at Edinburgh on Washington's Birth-Day, February 22d, 1811* (Edinburgh, 1811).

23. Silliman, *Journal of Travels*, 2:195; *Life, Letters, and Journals of Ticknor*, 1:55; James Rush to Benjamin Rush, September 10, 1810, box 11, Rush Family Papers (Library Company of Philadelphia); Thomas Lee Shippen to Richard Henry Lee, April 1, 1787, Shippen Family Papers (Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC). On hospitality, see Mann, "'Nation first in all the arts of civilization.'"

24. Noah, *Travels in England*, 240; John Chetwode Eustace, *A Classical Tour through Italy, in the year 1802*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: M. Carey, 1816), 1:ix. On Short, see George Green Shackelford, *Jefferson's Adoptive Son: The Life of William Short, 1759–1848* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1993), 38; Snow, "Grand Tour Diary," 83 (Sterne), 97 (Nugent). On British nationalism, see Linda Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992).

25. Jennifer Clark, "Poisoned Pens: The Anglo-American Relationship and the Paper War," *Symbiosis: A Journal of Anglo-American Literary Relations* 6 (2002): 45–68; Herbert

G. Eldridge, "The Paper War between England and America: The *Inchiquin* Episode," *Journal of American Studies* 16 (April 1982): 49–68; Eaton, "From Anglophile to Nationalist."

26. [James Kirke Paulding], *A Sketch of Old England, by a New-England Man* (New York: Charles Wiley, 1822), 5–6; Clark, "Poisoned Pens," 58.

27. Edgeworth to Griscom, March 4, 1824, Koopman Collection.

28. John Griscom, *A Year in Europe, Comprising a Journal of Observations, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, The North of Italy, and Holland in 1818 and 1819*, 2 vols. (New York: Collins and Hannay, 1824), 2:168–70.

29. Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), chap. 7; Frank Thistlethwaite, *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959); Daniel T. Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

30. Not among expansionist and proslavery southerners, however. Edward Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008), 180–221; Sam W. Haynes, "Anglophobia and the Annexation of Texas: The Quest for National Security," in *Manifest Destiny and Empire: American Antebellum Exceptionalism*, ed. Sam W. Haynes and Christopher Morris (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1997), 115–45. Michael O'Brien thinks that, culturally, England had lost much of its resonance for southerners by the early nineteenth century. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810–1860*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 1:109–10.

31. Joyce Appleby, *Inheriting the Revolution: The First Generation of Americans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).

32. Bigelow Diary, octavo vol. 6, May 3, 1817. "England, with all thy faults, I love thee still / My country! and while yet a nook is left / Where English minds and manners may be found, / Shall be constrain'd to love thee." William Cowper, *The Task*, bk. 2: *The Time-Piece*, in *The Works of William Cowper, Esq.: Comprising his Poems, Correspondence, and Translations*, 15 vols., ed. Robert Southey (London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1835–37), 9:104.

33. Benjamin Rush, "The French Fête in Philadelphia in Honor of the Dauphin's Birthday, 1782," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 21 (1897): 257–62.

34. Watson, *Men and Times of the Revolution*, 88.

35. Quoted in David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of American History and Culture, 1997), 126.

36. Thomas Lee Shippen to "Madam," July 30, 1789, Shippen Family Papers.

37. Ralph Izard Jr. to Alice Izard, November 21, 1801, Ralph Izard Family Papers 1778–1826 (Library of Congress). On new models for nationalism, see Hale, "'Many who wandered in darkness'"; and Robinson, "'Look on this Picture . . . and on This!'" On "cosmopolitan nationalism," see Philipp Ziesche, *Cosmopolitan Patriots: Americans in France in the Age of Revolution* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010).

38. John Brown Cutting to John Rutledge, December 26, 1790, John Rutledge Jr. Papers; John W. Godfrey Diary, June September 19, 1795, June 18, 1795 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

39. Thomas Branagan, *Political and Theological Disquisitions on the Signs of the Times, Relative to the Present Conquests of France, etc.* (Trenton, NJ: for the author, 1807), 5; A Citizen of the United States, *The Life of Napoleon Bonaparte; Late Emperor of the French, &c. &c. &c. From his Birth, until his Departure to the Island of St. Helena* (Philadelphia: W. Dobson, 1816), iv. *The Identity of Napoleon and Antechrist; Completely Demonstrated* . . . (New York: Ezra Sargeant, 1809).

40. James West to William West, January 26, 1811 (mass), March 30, 1811 (Louvre), August 31, 1811 ("no affection"), October 2, 1814 ("selfish"), West Family Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

41. John Tucker Bowdoin Diary, n.d., 75 ("diversified); October 20, 1818 (Cambrai); n.d., 125 ("intelligent") (Virginia Historical Society).

42. The emphasis here differs from that of William L. Chew III, "Life before Fodor and Frommer: Americans in Paris from Thomas Jefferson to John Quincy Adams," *French History* 18 (March 2004): 25–49, which argues that travel to Paris reinforced convictions of American exceptionalism.

43. Billy G. Smith, ed., *Down and Out in Early America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004).

44. Edward Pessen, *Riches, Class, and Power before the Civil War* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1973).

45. Thomas Russell-Greaves to Jefferson, September 27, 1788, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 13:616; Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 1:310; Watson, *Men and Times of the Revolution*, 146–47. On early national poverty, see Kenneth L. Kusmer, *Down and Out, On the Road: The Homeless in American History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Billy G. Smith, *The "Lower Sort": Philadelphia's Laboring People, 1750–1800* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990); Seth Rockman, *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); on Europe, see Robert Jutte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994). Informed Europeans also bought into this myth, at least until they came to the United States. Trisha Posey, "'Alive to the Cry of Distress': Joseph and Jane Sill and Poor Relief in Antebellum Philadelphia," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 132 (July 2008): 215–43.

46. Thomas Jefferson, "Notes of a Tour through Holland and the Rhine Valley," in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 13:13, 17.

47. Thomas Lee Shippen Journal, October 1–2, 1788, Shippen Family Papers; James West to William West, June 1811, box 1, folder 1, West Family Papers; Joel Roberts Poinsett, notes on Sicily, folder 7, p. 14, Joel Roberts Poinsett Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

48. Poinsett notes, folder 7, p. 14, Poinsett Papers; George Bancroft to Sarah & Jane Bancroft, May 11, 1820, box 1, folder 1, George Bancroft Correspondence (American Antiquarian Society). At the time of Poinsett's tour Sicily had been conquered by Napoleon. After his exile it became again part of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, which was administered from Naples. It is unclear to which "delegated authority" Poinsett is referring.

49. Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 1:302; "Miscellany," *Port Folio*, n.s., 2, no. 36 (September 13, 1806): 151–52.

50. Lee, *Memoirs of Buckminster*, 289; John W. Godfrey Diary, June 6, 1795. In a large literature on women in the early republic, see especially on this point Jan Lewis, "The Republican Wife: Virtue and Seduction in the Early Republic," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 44 (October 1987): 689–731; and Ruth H. Bloch, "The Gendered Meanings of Virtue in Revolutionary America," *Signs* 13 (Fall 1987): 37–58.

51. [Joseph Sansom], *Letters from Europe, During a Tour through Switzerland and Italy, in the Years 1801 and 1802, written by a Native of Pennsylvania*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: A. Bartram, 1805), 1:456–57; Theodore Lyman Jr., *The Political State of Italy* (Boston: Wells and Lilly, 1820), 365. On the emergence of this set of values, see Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992); Mann, "'Nation first in all the arts of civilisation,'" 20–26; on marriage, see Anya Jabour, *Marriage in the Early Republic: Elizabeth and William Wirt and the Companionate Ideal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998); also, C. Dallett Hemphill, "Middle Class Rising in Revolutionary America: The Evidence from Manners," *Journal of Social History* 30, no. 2 (Winter 1996): 317–44; Jacquelyn C. Miller, "'An Uncommon Tranquility of Mind': Emotional Self-Control and the Construction of a Middle-Class Identity in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia," *Journal of Social History* 30, no. 1 (Autumn 1996): 129–48.

52. John Davis, "Catholic Envy: The Visual Culture of Protestant Desire," in *The Visual Culture of American Religions*, ed. David Morgan and Sally M. Promey (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 105–28.

53. Ryan K. Smith, "Protestant Popery: Catholic Art in America's Protestant Churches, 1830–1890" (PhD diss., University of Delaware, 2002); Phoebe B. Stanton, *The Gothic Revival and American Church Architecture: An Episode in Taste, 1840–1856* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1968); Colleen McDannell, *Material Christianity: Religion and Popular Culture in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); David A. Gerber, "Ambivalent Anti-Catholicism: Buffalo's American Protestant Elite Faces the Challenge of the Catholic Church, 1850–1860," *Civil War History* 30 (June 1984): 120–43.

54. Bigelow Diary, octavo vol. 2, November 8, 1816; Sansom, *Letters from Europe*, 224–25; Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 1:304; Lee, *Memoirs of Buckminster*, 280.

55. Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 306; John Tucker Bowdoin Diary, n.d., 124; John W. Godfrey Diary, n.d. (Antwerp entry).

56. Yarborough, *Reminiscences of Preston*, 78–80.

57. Sansom, *Letters from Europe*, 73.

58. Godfrey Diary, n.d., n.p. (Ghent).

59. Bushman, *Refinement of America*, 203; also C. Dallett Hemphill, *Bowing to Necessities: A History of Manners in America, 1620–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pts. 2 and 3. Regarding American deference to European culture, David S. Shields writes that "though the American Revolution dissolved the legal ties binding the colonies to England, it did not break their dependence upon metropolitan manners or insulate them from the international market in fashionable goods." *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1997), 308.

60. Quoted in Robert Ralph Davis Jr., "Diplomatic Plumage: American Court Dress in the Early National Period," *American Quarterly* 20 (Summer 1968): 172.

61. Watson, *Men and Times of the Revolution*, 110–11; John Tucker Bowdoin Diary, December 9–10, 1818.

62. Harriet Balch Wilson Diary, August 17, 1815, Balch Family Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); George Bancroft to Mary Bancroft, May 30, 1819, box 1, folder 1, Bancroft Papers.

63. Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 2:126–28; Snow, "Grand Tour Diary," 102.

64. Wendy A. Nicholson, "Making the Private Public: Anne Willing Bingham's Role as a Leader of Philadelphia's Social Elite in the Late Eighteenth Century" (MA thesis, University of Delaware, 1988), 24; Samuel Eliot Morison, ed., *The Life and Letters of Harrison Gray Otis, Federalist, 1765–1848*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1913), 1:134–35. On aristocratic fashions, see Charlene Boyer-Lewis, "Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte: A Woman between Two Worlds," in *Old World, New World*, ed. Sadosky et al., 247–76.

65. Queries by John Gough of Kendal, Benjamin Rush section, folder labeled "Correspondence, bills, receipts, indentures, etc." (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Betty-Bright P. Low, "Of Muslins and Merveilleuses: Excerpts from the Letters of Josephine du Pont and Margaret Manigault," *Winterthur Portfolio* 9 (1974): 29–75.

66. Robert W. Gutman, *Mozart: A Cultural Biography* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1999), 45; Margaret Manigault to Alice Izard, February 9, 1805, February 13, 1805 (ref. to George), Ralph Izard Family Papers; Mary Stead Pinckney to Margaret Manigault, March 30, 1797, Manigault Family Papers (Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia).

67. Mary Helen Hering Middleton to Sepima Rutledge, April 27, 1822, October 12, 1821, Mrs. Henry Middleton (Mary Helen Hering Middleton) Correspondence, box 5, folder 9, J. Francis Fisher Section, series 9, Cadwalader Collection (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

68. James Rush to Julia Rush, October 25, 1809, box 11, Rush Family Papers (Library Company of Philadelphia); Noah Webster quoted in Shields, *Civil Tongues*, 308.

69. Joseph Manigault to Gabriel Manigault, October 24, 1783, Manigault Family Papers; Watson, *Men and Times of the Revolution*, 84; John Wickham Diary, April 16, 1784, Wickham Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Snow, "Grand Tour Diary," 84 (January 29, 1793). Regarding Americans' reception of English country houses, Wickham observed the following early in his English tour: "Passed by a great number of Gentlemen's seats extremely elegant in appearance & far superior to any idea I had formed of them while in America." Wickham Diary, February 29, 1784.

70. *Life, Letters, and Journals of Ticknor*, 1:152; Harriet (Balch) Wilson Diary, August 10, 1815; William Stephens Smith to Jefferson, January 9, 1788, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 12:501; Thomas Lee Shippen to William Shippen, February 14–March 26, 1788, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 12:502–3.

71. Yarborough, *Reminiscences of Preston*, 59–60. Lloyd S. Kramer, *Lafayette in Two Worlds: Public Cultures and Personal Identities in an Age of Revolutions* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

72. Sean Wilentz argues that democracy in the early United States was "highly contested, not a given, and developed piecemeal, in fits and starts." *The Rise of American Democracy: From Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), xxi; Bushman, *Refinement of America*, 181–203.

73. Yarborough, *Reminiscences of Preston*, 53; Shackelford, *Jefferson's Adoptive Son*, 52–53.

74. Boyer-Lewis, "Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte," 268.

75. Joel Roberts Poinsett to Eliza Poinsett, n.d. [1796], Gilpin Family Papers, Joel R. Poinsett Section, Correspondence (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); James Rush to Julia Rush, December 1, 1809, box 11, Rush Family Papers; Jefferson to Thomas Lee Shippen, September 29, 1788, in Boyd, *Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 13:642; Shippen to William Shippen, April 15, 1788, Shippen Family Papers.

76. George Bancroft to Sarah and Jane Bancroft, May 11, 1820, box 1, folder 1, George Bancroft Papers; *Life, Letters, and Journals of Ticknor*, 146; Thomas Lee Shippen Travel Journals, vol. 5, January 19, 1788, Shippen Family Papers.

77. Kinloch, *Letters from Geneva and France*, 59–60; Noah, *Travels in England*, 212. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev. ed. (London: Verso, 2006), 6; Murrin, "Roof without Walls."

78. Diary of Major William S. Dallam, April 1, 1795, Catherine and Howard Evans Papers (Special Collections and Archives, Margaret I. King Library, University of Kentucky Library, Lexington); Yarborough, *Reminiscences of Preston*, 91, 99.

79. Alice Izard to Ralph Izard Jr., October 6, 1801, Ralph Izard Family Papers; Dallam Diary, July 4, 1795, September 2, 1795, October 7, 1975; John Godfrey Diary, July 4, 1795.

80. Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 317.

81. Peter Ounf, "Introduction," in *Old World, New World*, ed. Sadosky et al., 4.

Chapter 3 • "What we Anglo-Americans understand by the significant word comfort," 1821–1850

1. Gordon S. Wood observes, "By the second decade of the nineteenth century Americans were already referring to themselves as a society dominated by the 'middling' sort." *The Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 347.

2. George Endicott to William Endicott, August 15, 1847, box 2, folder 2, Endicott Family Papers (Manuscripts Department, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Massachusetts).

3. James Fenimore Cooper, *Home As Found* (1838; New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1871), 45.

4. Nicholas B. Wainwright, ed., *A Philadelphia Perspective: The Diary of Sidney George Fisher Covering the Years 1834–1871* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Pennsylvania, 1967), 16 (entry for December 26, 1836); Rev. Orville Dewey, *The Old World and the New;*

or, a Journal of Reflections and Observations Made on a Tour of Europe, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1836), 1:vii–viii.

5. Sidney George Fisher to Joshua Francis Fisher, July 29, 1832, section 4, box 19, Brinton Coxe Collection (Manuscripts Department, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia); *The Wedding Journey of Charles and Martha Babcock Amory: Letters of Mrs. Amory to her Mother Mrs. Gardiner Greene 1833–1834*, 2 vols. (Boston: privately printed, 1922), 1:4.

6. Joseph Sargent to John Weiss, January 1843, John Weiss Correspondence (American Antiquarian Society); Ansel James McCall Diary, December 31, 1847, December 31, 1848, McCall Family Papers (Kroch Library, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University).

7. As Anthony Fletcher says of the English Grand Tour, "The hazards of travel—robbery, dangers to health and life—tested masculine spirit and endurance . . . taken overall, the point of the Grand Tour was not simply becoming a gentleman but becoming a man." *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 317.

8. George B. Cheever, *Wanderings of a Pilgrim in the Shadow of Mont Blanc* (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845), 103. On the critics of commodification, see Will B. Mackintosh, "Ticketed Through: The Commodification of Travel in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of the Early Republic* 32 (Spring 2012): 61–89 (quotation on 88); Carol Sheriff, *The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress, 1817–1862* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), 57–58; on how this process affected travel and tourism, see Jeremy Black, *The British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: St. Martin's, 1992); James Buzard, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to "Culture," 1800–1918* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

9. Lydia Maria Child, *The Mother's Book* (Boston: Carter, Hendee, and Babcock, 1831), 148–49; Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790–1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

10. Stuart M. Blumin, *The Emergence of the Middle Class: Social Experience in the American City, 1760–1900* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Jonathan Daniel Wells, *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800–1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004); C. Dallett Hemphill, *Bowing to Necessities: A History of Manners in America, 1620–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).

11. On South Carolina see Manisha Sinha, *The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). Elsewhere, argues William Gienapp, "by 1840, the tide of political democracy had swept all before it. . . . Any member of the elite unwilling to make this transition either muffled his dissent or retired from public life." "'Politics Seems to Enter into Everything': Political Culture in the North, 1840–1860," in *Essays on American Antebellum Politics, 1840–1860*, ed. Stephen E. Maizlish and John J. Kushman (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1982), 38.

12. Patricia Cline Cohen, *The Murder of Helen Jewett: The Life and Death of a Prostitute in Nineteenth-Century New York* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998); Elliott J. Gorn,

" 'Good-Bye Boys, I Die a True American': Homicide, Nativism, and Working-Class Culture in Antebellum New York City," *Journal of American History* 74 (September 1987): 388–410; David S. Reynolds, *Walt Whitman's America: A Cultural Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995), 154–235.

13. Henry Middleton to Elizabeth Middleton, June 27, 1836 (Jonathans), November 10, 1836 (underbred), box 1, folder 4; Joshua Francis Fisher to Sophia Harrison, October 16, 1830 (ignorance); to George Harrison, December 1830 (friends), box 1, folder 4, all letters in Cadwalader Collection, J. Francis Fisher Section, series 10 (Historical Society of Pennsylvania).

14. Mary Telfair to Mary Few, July 2, 1842 ("improvement," "better American"), September 25, 1842 ("better Presbyterian," "better republican"), October 18, 1842 ("brilliant"), in Betty Wood, ed., *Mary Telfair to Mary Few: Selected Letters, 1802–1844* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007), 222–28.

15. For a concise statement of this worldview, see Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), chap. 8.

16. Stuart M. Blumin, "The Social Implications of U.S. Economic Development," in *The Cambridge Economic History of the United States*, vol. 2, *The Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Stanley L. Engerman and Robert E. Gallman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 830–31.

17. Edward Pessen, *Riches, Class, and Power: America before the Civil War* (1973; New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1990), 2–3.

18. J. C. Furnas, *Fanny Kemble: Leading Lady of the Nineteenth-Century Stage: A Biography* (New York: Dial, 1982), 299; Stacey M. Robertson, *Parker Pillsbury: Radical Abolitionist, Male Feminist* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 113; Henry Colman, *European Life and Manners; in Familiar Letters to Friends*, 2 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1850), 1:100; Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 201; Frederick William Gale Diary, May 10, 1847, octavo vol. 2, Gale Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society).

19. Rev. John A. Clark, *Glimpses of the Old World; or, Excursions on the Continent, and in the Island of Great Britain*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: W. Marshall, 1840), 1:71–72; Josephine Dulles (Horner) Eppes Diary, January 24, 1851, section 8, Eppes Family Muniments (Virginia Historical Society, Richmond); Daniel Aiken Travel Diary, vol. 2, n.d. [1848–49] (Manuscripts Department, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston), n.p.; Samuel S. Cox, *A Buckeye Abroad; or, Wanderings in Europe, and in the Orient* (Cincinnati: Moore, Anderson, 1854), 88.

20. [Catharine Maria Sedgwick], *Letters from Abroad to Kindred at Home*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1841), 1:138; James Colles Sr. to James Colles Jr., August 29, 1841, in Emily Johnston De Forest, ed., *James Colles, 1788–1883: Life & Letters* (New York: privately printed, 1926), 134–35.

21. Seth Rockman observes, "American civic culture . . . has left little possibility for recognizing the contingencies through which opportunity for some has had its basis in the foreclosing of opportunity for others." *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival*

in Early Baltimore (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 259. See also Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 449–53.

22. Octavia Jones Diary, September 1, 1844, Calvin Jones Papers (Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill). For Jones's poetic reference to William Cowper, see chap. 2, n. 32.

23. Samuel Colton Journal, 13, 53 (American Antiquarian Society); on Tuckerman, see William L. Vance, *America's Rome*, vol. 2, *Catholic & Contemporary Rome* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), 122; Mrs. A. J. T. Bullard, *Sights and Scenes in Europe: A Series of Letters from England, France, Germany, Switzerland and Italy, in 1850* (St. Louis: Chambers and Knapp, 1852), 177; Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 2:217–18, 117; Cox, *Buckeye Abroad*, 277.

24. Edward Pessen says that the illusion appealed to "inveterate yeasayers, boastful nationalists, and sour snobs." *Riches, Class, and Power*, 304. On inequality, see Clayne Pope, "Inequality in the Nineteenth Century," in *Cambridge Economic History*, ed. Engerman and Gallman, 135; Jeremy Atack and Fred Bateman, "Egalitarianism, Inequality, and Age: The Rural North in 1860," *Journal of Economic History* 41 (1981): 85–93; Atack and Bateman, "The 'Egalitarian Ideal' and the Distribution of Wealth in the Northern Agricultural Community: A Backward Look," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 63 (February 1981): 124–29.

25. Winona Stevenson, "Beggars, Chickabobbooags, and Prisons: Paxoche (Ioway) Views of English Society, 1844–45," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 17 (1993): 1–23.

26. Furnas, *Fanny Kemble*, 167; C. Edwards Lester, *The Glory and Shame of England*, 2 vols. (London: Richard Bentley, 1841), 1:50.

27. Robert E. Gallman, "Professor Pessen on the 'Egalitarian Myth,'" *Social Science History* 2 (Winter 1978): 194–207.

28. Eliza Quitman to John Quitman, July 26, 1839, series 1.1, folder 16, Quitman Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection).

29. "The Great Nation of Futurity," *United States Magazine, and Democratic Review* 6 (July 1839): 426–27; Faust, *Hammond and the Old South*, 193; [William Mitchell Gillespie], *Rome: As Seen by a New-Yorker in 1843–4* (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845), 33–35.

30. Frederick William Gale Diary, octavo vol. 2, May 9, 1847 (Dublin), June 22, 1847 (Normandy); Abram David Pollock Travel Diary, 1841, 53–54, box 3, folder 36, A. D. Pollock Papers (Southern Historical Collection).

31. John Edward Doyle Diary, April 1, 1840, Doyle Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Donald G. Rohr, ed., *The Young John Carter Brown in Europe: Travel Diaries, 1823–1824* (Providence: John Carter Brown Library, 2005), 82 (October 3, 1823); Garner Ranney, ed., *A Man of Pleasure—and a Man of Business: The European Travel Diaries of Duncan Farrar Kenner, 1833–1834* (New Orleans: Center for Louisiana Studies and the Hermitage Foundation, 1991), 12 (May 22, 1833); Clark, *Glimpses of the Old World*, 2:332.

32. Dewey, *Old World and the New*, 2:37–38; John H. Martinstein to Emily Martinstein, June 27, 1835, Martinstein-Durrive Papers (Manuscripts Department, Special Collections

Division, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University, New Orleans); Daniel Aiken Travel Diary, vol. 1, "Matlock-Bath" [n.d., n.p.]. On art and nature, see Sheriff, *Artificial River*, 27–35.

33. The classic work on the sublime is Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Inquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, ed. Adam Philips (1757; New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). On travel and the sublime, see Dona Brown, *Inventing New England: Regional Tourism in the Nineteenth Century* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995); Bruce Robertson, "The Picturesque Tourist in America," in *Views and Visions: American Landscape before 1830*, ed. Edward J. Nygren (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1986), 189–211; and John F. Sears, *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

34. In addition to the works cited above, see Gideon M. Davison, *The Fashionable Tour, in 1825: An Excursion to the Springs, Niagara, Quebec, and Boston* (Saratoga Springs: G. M. Davison, 1825).

35. Alice P. Kenney, "Kate Gansevoort's Grand Tour," *New York History* 47 (1966): 347; Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, July 17, 1851 (Southern Historical Collection); John Henry Hobart, *The United States of America Compared with Some European Countries, Particularly England: In a Discourse Delivered in Trinity Church, and in St. Paul's and St. John's Chapels, in the City of New-York, October, 1825*, 2nd ed. (New York: T. and J. Swords, 1826), 9.

36. Frederick Gale Diary, January 12, 1849, Gale Family Papers. Emma Willard, *Journal and Letters, from France and Great-Britain* (Troy, NY: N. Tuttle, 1833); Frederick B. Tolles, ed., *Slavery and "The Woman Question": Lucretia Mott's Diary of Her Visit to Great Britain to Attend the World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840*, supplement no. 23, *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* (Haverford, PA: Friends Historical Association, 1952); Alan J. Rice and Martin Crawford, eds., *Liberating Sojourn: Frederick Douglass & Transatlantic Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999); Valentine Mott, *Travels in Europe and the East . . . in the Years 1834, '35, '36, '37, '38, '39, '40, and '41* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1842).

37. Levin Smith Joynes to William T. Joynes, January 9, 1842, section 7, Joynes Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society). On these efforts, see Howe, *What Hath God Wrought*; Ronald G. Walters, *American Reformers, 1815–1860*, rev. ed. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1997); on transatlantic connections, see Frank Thistlewaite, *The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959); and Bonnie S. Anderson, *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women's Movement, 1830–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

38. Nathaniel Ames, *Nautical Reminiscences* (Providence: William Marshall, 1832), 32. S. M. Robertson, *Parker Pillsbury*, 112.

39. Stephen Salisbury II to Elizabeth Salisbury, October 29, 30, 1829, folder 2, box 23, Salisbury Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society); Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 2:201; Mott, *Travels in Europe and the East*, 170.

40. James Minor Glassell Diary, September 13, 1825, section 12, folder 1, Grinnan Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Abram Pollock Diary, n.d., 118; Ranney, *Man of Pleasure*, 2, 20.

41. John Griscom, *A Year in Europe, Comprising a Journal of Observations, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Switzerland, The North of Italy, and Holland in 1818 and 1819*, 2 vols. (New York: Collins and Hannay, 1824), 2:170; Thistlewaite, *Anglo-American Connection*, chap. 4.

42. Pliny Earle to "My Dear Sister," February 12, 1838, in Bound Letterbook, Pliny Earle Papers (American Antiquarian Society); Thistlewaite, *Anglo-American Connection*, 86; Cox, *Buckeye Abroad*, 35. Fry gave her audience a pamphlet by Robert Newstead to distribute in Paris entitled "Thoughts on the Moral Influence Exercised upon Paris and the Continent in General by English Residents and Visitors." I have been unable to locate a copy. See also June Rose, *Elizabeth Fry* (London: Macmillan, 1980).

43. Isaac Appleton Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 2 vols. (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1838), 2:186; Elliott Cresson Journal, February 1–6, 1826, [262] (Library Company of Philadelphia); Henry T. Cheever Diary, August 16, 1835, octavo vol. 13, Cheever-Wheeler Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society); Margaret Fuller Ossoli, *At Home and Abroad, or Things and Thoughts in America and Europe*, ed. Arthur B. Fuller (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1856), 308.

44. Wells, *Origins of the Southern Middle Class*, chap. 5; Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class*; Jane Turner Censer, *North Carolina Planters and Their Children, 1800–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1984).

45. Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 2:23.

46. Martha Richardson to James P. Screven, January 21, 1821, folder 33, Arnold and Screven Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection); Elizabeth Salisbury to Stephen Salisbury II, September 1829, folder 5, box 23, Salisbury Family Papers; J. Francis Fisher to Elizabeth Fisher, November 5, 1830, box 1, folder 1, Fisher Section, Cadwalader Collection.

47. Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 1:103; Rev. Charles Rockwell, *Sketches of Foreign Travel and Life at Sea . . .* , 2 vols. (Boston: Tappan and Dennet, 1842), 2:4–5; Clark, *Glimpses of the Old World*, 1:433.

48. Caroline Kirkland, *Holidays Abroad; or, Europe from the West* (New York: Baker and Scribner, 1849), 125; Jane Anthony Eames, *Budget of Letters, or Things which I Saw Abroad* (Boston: William D. Ticknor, 1847), 267; Henry Middleton to Elizabeth Middleton, March 3, 1837, Cadwalader Collection, Fisher Section. On Bonaparte, see Charlene Boyer-Lewis, "Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte: A Woman between Two Worlds," in *Old World, New World: America and Europe in the Age of Jefferson*, ed. Leonard J. Sadosky et al. (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 247–76.

49. James Colles Sr. to James Colles Jr., November 15, 1842, in De Forest, *James Colles*, 142; Mott, *Travels in Europe and the East*, 155; Henry T. Cheever Diary, vol. 2, p. 37 (entry for October 19, 1835). Cheever is quoting Oliver Goldsmith's poem "The Deserted Village." The implications for domesticity and comfort are explored in Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 267–72; and John E. Crowley, *The Invention of Comfort: Sensibilities & Design in Early Modern Britain and Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001).

50. John E. Doyle Diary, June 4, 1840, March 2, 1840; Cox, *Buckeye Abroad*, 26; Catharine E. Beecher, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy, For the Use of Young Ladies at Home*

and School, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1849), 156–57; Sedgwick, *Letters from Abroad*, 1:120.

51. J. Morrison Harris Diary, vol. 2, April 19, [1844], J. Morrison Harris Papers (Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore).

52. Bullard, *Sights and Scenes in Europe*, 174; Mary Helen Middleton to Septima Rutledge, July 8, 1822, folder 9, box 5, Fisher Section, Cadwalader Collection. Daniel Walker Howe, "American Victorianism as a Culture," *American Quarterly* 27 (December 1975): 507–32.

53. George Handel Hill, *Scenes from the Life of an Actor. Compiled from the Journals, Letters, and Memoranda of the Late Yankee Hill* (New York: Garrett, 1853), 131; Pliny Earle to "My Dear Sister," September 9, 1837, June 27, 1837 (dangers), Bound Letterbook, Pliny Earle Papers; Mary Grosvenor Bangs [Salisbury] Diary, September 16, 1848, vol. 14, box 63, Salisbury Family Papers; William A. Williams Diary, July 23, 1833, John and William A. Williams Papers (Southern Historical Collection).

54. Willard, *Journals and Letters*, 183, 316 (dinner); "Editor's Table," *Godey's Lady's Book* 40 (February 1850): 148, quoting Edward D. Mansfield, *The Legal Rights, Liabilities and Duties of Woman . . .* (Salem, MA: John P. Jewett, 1845), 42; Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 1:134, 2:281; Julia Haylander Diary, "London," [Summer 1833], Charles Dewey Papers (Southern Historical Collection).

55. Frederick Gale Diary, octavo vol. 3, October 28, 1849; Willard, *Journals and Letters*, 96–97, 46; Harvey Levenstein, *Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), chap. 9.

56. Sedgwick, *Letters from Abroad*, 2:37; Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, August 10, 1851 (Southern Historical Collection).

57. Frederick Gale Diary, octavo vol. 2, May 12, 1847; *Wedding Journey of Charles and Martha Babcock Amory*, 12; Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, July 13, 1851.

58. Henry Middleton to Elizabeth Middleton, March 3, 1837, Cadwalader Papers, Fisher Section; Rodman Paul to Sidney Paul, September 27, 1823, Paul Family Papers (Historical Society of Pennsylvania); Catherine Wheaton to Levi Wheaton, January 1, 1837, Wheaton Collection (Manuscript Department, Hay Library, Brown University).

59. Nancy Craig Simmons, ed., "The 'Autobiographical Sketch' of James Elliot Cabot," *Harvard Library Bulletin* 30 (1982): 137; James Minor Glassell Diary, November 20, 1825, section 12, folder 1, Grinnan Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Willard, *Journal and Letters*, 100–101.

60. Rev. Robert Turnbull, *The Genius of Italy: Being Sketches of Italian Life, Literature, and Religion* (New York: George P. Putnam, 1849), 305; George Washington Greene, "Hopes of Italy," *North American Review* 66 (1848): 2, 24.

61. Bushman, *Refinement of America*; Hemphill, *Bowing to Necessities*.

62. Julia Ann Haylander Diary, n.d., n.p.; Henry T. Cheever Diary, July 8, 1835, vol. 13, Cheever-Wheeler Family Papers.

63. Charlotte Bronson Hunnewell Martin, ed., *The Letters of Charlotte Brinckerhoff Bronson, Written, during her Wedding Journey in Europe in 1838 . . .*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, MA: privately printed, 1928), 1:10; Dewey, *Old World and the New*, 1:16; "Steam-Ships and Packets," *New Yorker* 5, no. 24 (September 1, 1838): 380; James Freeman Clarke, *Eleven*

Weeks in Europe; and What May Be Seen in that Time (Boston: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1852), 326. On conditions aboard packets and steamships, see Stephen Fox, *Transatlantic: Samuel Cunard, Isambard Brunel, and the Great Atlantic Steamships* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), pt. 1.

64. Willard, *Journals and Letters*, 1:38; Henry Middleton to Elizabeth Middleton, April 25, 1837, Fisher Section, Cadwalader Collection; Elizabeth Walsh to John Stille, September 15, 1837, box 50, Edward Carey Gardinier Collection, Miscellaneous Section (Historical Society of Pennsylvania). Richard Bushman observes that "the expense of refinement, its seeming incongruity with work, its superficiality and uselessness, [and] its focus on entertainment above family" pitted gentility against middle-class, republican manners. Bushman, *Refinement of America*, 302.

65. *New York Mirror* quoted in Furnas, *Fanny Kemble*, 181; Thomas G. Cary, *Letter to a Lady in France on the Supposed Failure of a National Bank, the Supposed Delinquency of the National Government, the Debts of the Several States, and Repudiation; with Answers to Enquiries Concerning the Books of Capt. Marryat and Mr. Dickens*, 3rd ed. (Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 1844), 41.

66. Clarke, *Eleven Weeks in Europe*, 188; Henry T. Cheever Diary, vol. 2, November 21, 1835; Stephen Salisbury II to Elizabeth Salisbury, May 14, 1831, folder 7, box 24, Salisbury Family Papers.

67. Mrs. Samuel Jaudon to Harriet Colles, July 14, 1844, in De Forest, *James Colles*, 203; Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 1:20–21; John Edward Doyle Diary, December 18, 1839.

68. William E. Gienapp, "The Republican Party and the Slave Power," in *New Perspectives on Race and Slavery in America: Essays in Honor of Kenneth M. Stampp*, ed. Robert H. Abzug and Stephen E. Maizlish (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1986), 51; Bushman, *Refinement of America*, 308.

69. James Brown to Susan Price, February 10, 1829, Susannah (Hart) Price Papers (Special Collections, Filson Club Historical Library, Louisville, KY); "Augusta's Diary," January 8, 1842, in De Forest, *James Colles*, 136; *Wedding Journey of Charles and Martha Babcock Amory*, 1:21–22.

70. Charles J. Johnson Jr., *Mary Telfair: The Life and Legacy of a Nineteenth-Century Woman* (Savannah: Frederic C. Beil, 2002), 304; Mary Telfair to Mary Few, July 13, 1842, in B. Wood, *Mary Telfair to Mary Few*, 225 ("*Republican* eye"); Josephine Eppes Journal, June 14, 1850; William Terrell to Eliza Terrell, July 8, 1850, William Eliza Rhodes Terrell Papers (David M. Rubinstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, Durham, NC).

71. "Carter's *Letters from Europe*," *American Quarterly Review* 2, no. 2 (December 1827): 584, 560; Willard, *Journals and Letters*, 44; Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, May 30, 1851.

72. H. Edwards to Stephen Salisbury II, October 3, 1830, folder 3, box 24, Salisbury Family Papers; Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 1:200–203; Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 2:156; Daniel Aiken Travel Journal, June 12, 1849.

73. Leonard L. Richards, *Gentlemen of Property and Standing: Anti-Abolition Mobs in Jacksonian America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); David Grimsted, *American*

Mobbing, 1828–1861: Toward Civil War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Christopher Morris, *Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 120–21; Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 100–104.

74. Willard, *Journals and Letters*, 92; Kirkland, *Holidays Abroad*, 1:95–96; Cox, *Buckeye Abroad*, 82–83.

75. George Endicott to William Endicott, September 28, 1847, carton 2, folder 1, Endicott Family Papers; John H. Martinstein to Emily Martinstein, July 7, 1835, Martinstein-Durrive Family Papers.

76. Mary Mayo Crenshaw, ed., *An American Lady in Paris, 1828–1829: The Diary of Mrs. John Mayo (Abigail de Hart Mayo)* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1927), 19; Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 2:181.

77. For the unsettled nature of civil liberties in this period, see Mark E. Neely Jr., "The Constitution and Civil Liberties under Lincoln," in *Our Lincoln: New Perspectives on Lincoln and His World*, ed. Eric Foner (New York: W. W. Norton, 2008), 37–61.

78. On immigration, see Marcus Lee Hansen, *The Atlantic Migration, 1607–1860* (New York: Harper, 1951); Kerby A. Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985); Mack Walker, *Germany and the Emigration, 1816–1885* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964); on nativism, see Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1938); Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism & Slavery: The Northern Know-Nothings & The Politics of the 1850s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

79. Jenny Franchot, *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter with Catholicism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); Jon Gjerde, *Catholicism and the Shaping of Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. S. Deborah Kang (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), and the works cited in chap. 2, nn. 52 and 53.

80. J. Peter Lesley Diary, vol. 4, August 16, 1844, series 1, box 1, J. Peter Lesley Papers (American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia); Elliott Cresson Journal, December 25, 1825; Isabella Bowen Faber Diary, April 1838, n.p.

81. Dewey quoted in Vance, *America's Rome*, 2:115; Clark, *Glimpses of the Old World*, 1:133.

82. Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, July 23, 1851; Elliott Cresson Journal, December 19, 1825, January 2, 1826. Daniel A. Cohen, "Miss Reed and the Superiors: The Contradictions of Convent Life in Antebellum America," *Journal of Social History* 30 (Fall 1996): 149–85; Cohen, "The Respectability of Rebecca Reed: Genteel Womanhood and Sectarian Conflict in Antebellum America," *Journal of the Early Republic* 16 (Fall 1996): 419–62.

83. Frederick Gale Diary, octavo vol. 3, October 14, 1849; J. Peter Lesley Diary, August 10, 1844; Henry T. Cheever Diary, vol. 2, September 11, 1835.

84. Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 2:256; Rockwell, *Sketches of Foreign Travel*, 1:ix; Henry T. Cheever Diary, vol. 2, September 11, 1835.

85. Cheever, *Wanderings of a Pilgrim*, 20–21; Rockwell, *Sketches of Foreign Travel*, 1:311.

86. Sedgwick, *Letters from Abroad*, 2:230–31; Roe (?) Diary, May 12, 1844 (American Antiquarian Society).

87. Colman, *European Life and Manners*, 2:123; Martha Custis (Williams) Diary, March 24, 1853, Diary B, pt. 2, p. 44 (Tudor Place Manuscript Collection, Washington, DC).

88. Bullard, *Sights and Scenes in Europe*, 116; Rohr, *Young John Carter Brown*, 175 (entry for February 12, 1824); Frederick Gale Diary, octavo vol. 4, February 25, 1850.

89. Elliott Cresson Journal, December 25, 1866; Rockwell, *Sketches of Foreign Travel*, 2:22; J. Peter Lesley Diary, August 18, 1844. On the outlandish strain in antebellum culture, see David S. Reynolds, *Waking Giant: America in the Age of Jackson* (New York: Harper, 2008), 296.

90. Samuel Colton Journal, 11 (American Antiquarian Society).

91. Jewett, *Passages in Foreign Travel*, 2:25.

Chapter 4 • "The manifold advantages resulting from our glorious Union," 1840–1861

1. J. Bayard Taylor, *Views A-Foot; or, Europe Seen with Knapsack and Staff*, 9th ed. (New York: George P. Putnam, 1850), 400.

2. In a large literature, see Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); R. J. W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann, eds., *The Revolutions in Europe, 1848–1849: From Reform to Reaction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

3. The literature on American responses to individual revolutions is extensive. The major works include: on the 1789 Revolution, David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1997); Stanley Elkins and Eric McKitrick, *The Age of Federalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Simon P. Newman, *Parades and the Politics of the Street: Festive Culture in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997); on Haiti, Ashli White, *Encountering Revolution: Haiti and the Making of the Early Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010); on France in 1830, Eugene N. Curtis, "American Opinion of the French Nineteenth-Century Revolutions," *American Historical Review* 29 (January 1924): 249–70; on Spanish America, James E. Lewis Jr., *The American Union and the Problem of Neighborhood: The United States and the Collapse of the Spanish Empire, 1783–1829* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Piero Gleijeses, "The Limits of Sympathy: The United States and the Independence of Spanish America," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 24 (October 1992): 481–506; on Greece, Paul C. Pappas, *The United States and the Greek War for Independence, 1821–1828* (Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1985); on Poland, Jerzy J. Lerski, *A Polish Chapter in Jacksonian America: The United States and the Polish Exiles of 1831* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958).

4. *Commercial Advertiser*, April 2, 1831; Cooper to Benjamin Silliman, June 10, 1831, in James Fenimore Cooper, *Letters and Journals*, ed. James Franklin Beard, 6 vols. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960–68), 2:97–98.

5. Works that stress Americans' wariness toward revolutions include William Appleman Williams, *America Confronts a Revolutionary World: 1776–1976* (New York: Morrow, 1976); Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987); David Brion Davis, *Revolutions: Reflections on American Equality and Foreign Liberations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Richard C. Rohrs, "American Critics of the French Revolution of 1848," *Journal of the Early Republic* 14 (Autumn 1994): 359–77; Timothy Mason Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009); and Paola Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles: The Italian Risorgimento and Antebellum American Identity* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2005).

6. For overviews, see Merle Curti, "The Impact of the Revolutions of 1848 on American Thought," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 93 (June 1949): 209–15; Curtis, "American Opinion"; Timothy M. Roberts and Daniel Walker Howe, "The United States and the Revolutions of 1848," in *Revolutions in Europe*, ed. Evans and von Strandmann, 157–80; Roberts, *Distant Revolutions*.

7. *Tribune* quoted in Curtis, "American Opinion," 256; Elisha Ballantine, *America, the Teacher of the Nations: A Sermon Preached in the First Presbyterian Church of Washington, D.C., Sabbath, December 23, 1849* (Washington, DC: Gideon, 1850), 8.

8. Mark Trafton, a Massachusetts divine and nativist representative from Massachusetts, estimated that three thousand Americans were in Paris in 1850. John Jay Smith, a Philadelphia librarian, probably referred only to the permanent residents when he estimated the number of Americans in that city at three hundred. Between 1848 and 1850, over 850 Americans spent some time in Rome, according to records published in the city's newspapers. Mark Trafton, *Rambles in Europe: In a Series of Familiar Letters* (Boston: Charles H. Peirce, 1852), 172; Smith's figures quoted in Guillaume de Bertier de Sauvigny, "American Travelers in France, 1814–1848," in *Diplomacy in an Age of Nationalism: Essays in Honor of Lynn Marshall Case*, ed. Nancy M. Barker and Marvin L. Brown Jr. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971), 16; Howard R. Marraro, "Viaggiatoria Americani a Roma," *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* 51 (1964): 237–56. See also Brandon Dupont, Alka Gandhi, and Thomas J. Weiss, "The American Invasion of Europe: The Long Term Rise in Overseas Travel, 1820–2000," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13977 (May 2008), 17–18 and table 1, p. 54.

9. Philip Claiborne Gooch Diary, February 23–25, 1848, Gooch Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society, Richmond); Charles Godfrey Leland to Charles Leland, February 29, 1848, in Elizabeth Robins Pennell, *Charles Godfrey Leland: A Biography*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906), 1:195; Samuel G. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime, or Men and Things I Have Seen . . .* , 2 vols. (New York: Miller, Orton, 1857), 2:472, 474.

10. Charles Ellet Jr. to Charles Ellet Sr., July 27, 1830, in Herbert P. Gambrell, ed., "Three Letters on the Revolution of 1830," *Journal of Modern History* 1 (December 1929): 597; John C. Calhoun to Thomas G. Clemson, March 22, 1848, quoted in Charles M. Wiltse, "A Critical Southerner: John C. Calhoun on the Revolutions of 1848," *Journal of*

Southern History 15 (August 1949): 301; *Congressional Globe*, 30th Congress, 1st Session, 569; *National Intelligencer*, March 28, 1848. On the Whigs and 1848, see Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); a less subtle statement of partisan difference is made in Sean Wilentz, *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2005), 611.

11. Margaret Fuller Ossoli, *At Home and Abroad, or Things and Thoughts in America and Europe*, ed. Arthur B. Fuller (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, 1856), 240; Aiken quoted in Gabriel Edward Manigault, "Autobiography," 57, Manigault Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill); Rev. J. H. Thornwell, *The Rights and Duties of Masters. A Sermon Preached at the Dedication of a Church, Erected in Charleston, S.C., for the Benefit and Instruction of the Coloured Population* (Charleston: Walker and James, 1850), 14. On southerners' West Indian anxieties, see Edward Bartlett Rugemer, *The Problem of Emancipation: The Caribbean Roots of the American Civil War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008).

12. Joel R. Poinsett to Martin Van Buren, January 8, 1849, Martin Van Buren Papers (Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC); *National Intelligencer*, October 6, 1848.

13. Nathaniel Niles to John M. Clayton, December 2, 1849, in Howard R. Marraro, ed., *L'Unificazione Italiana Vista dai Diplomatici Statunitensi*, 4 vols. (Rome: Istituto per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, 1963–71), 2:154 (Sardinia); Niles on southern Italy quoted in Emiliana P. Noether, "The American Response to the 1848 Revolutions in Rome and Budapest," *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe 1750–1850: Proceedings* 15 (1985): 383; John M. Daniel to W. W. Crump, January 24, 1855, John M. Daniel Papers (Virginia Historical Society); *Daily Picayune*, November 19, 1848.

14. David J. Weber, "'Scarce More than Apes': Historical Roots of Anglo-American Stereotypes of Mexicans," in *New Spain's Far Northern Frontier: Essays on Spain in the American West, 1540–1821*, ed. David J. Weber (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1979), 239–307; Arnoldo de León, *They Called Them Greasers: Anglo Attitudes toward Mexicans in Texas, 1821–1900* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983); Steven Conn, *History's Shadow: Native Americans and Historical Consciousness in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

15. Samuel S. Cox, *A Buckeye Abroad; or, Wanderings in Europe, and in the Orient* (Cincinnati: Moore, Anderson, 1854), 376. See also William Thomas Kerrigan, "'Young America!': Romantic Nationalism in Literature and Politics, 1843–1861" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1997), 150–52; Yonatan Eyal, *The Young America Movement and the Transformation of the Democratic Party, 1828–1861* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

16. Miles Taylor, "The 1848 Revolution and the British Empire," *Past & Present* 166 (February 2000): 146–80; John Belchem, "Britishness, the United Kingdom, and the Revolutions of 1848," *Labour History Review* 64 (Summer 1999): 143–58; Eugene Kamenka and F. B. Smith, "The View from Britain I: 'Tumults Abroad, Stability at Home'"; and J. H. Grainger, Kamenka, and Smith, "The View from Britain II: The Moralizing Island," in *Intellectuals and Revolution: Socialism and the Experience of 1848*, ed. F. B. Smith and Eugene Kamenka (New York: St. Martin's, 1979), 94–120, 121–30; Emile de

Groot, "Contemporary Political Opinion and the Revolutions of 1848," *History* 38 (June 1953): 134–54; Thomas Kabdebo, "The Reception of Kossuth in England and the Magazine *Punch* in 1851," *Hungarian Studies* 1 (1985): 225–34.

17. Theodore Dwight, *The Roman Republic of 1849; with Accounts of the Inquisition, and the Siege of Rome* . . . (New York: R. Van Dien, 1851), ix, 16; "Description of Naples," *Southern Literary Messenger* 8 (November 1842): 698. On the evolution of Americans' views of Risorgimento-era Rome, see William L. Vance, *America's Rome*, vol. 2, *Catholic and Contemporary Rome* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989).

18. For an indictment of the travel sketch, see Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture* (1977; New York: Noonday, 1998), 237–38.

19. Henry T. Tuckerman, "A Word for Italy," *United States Democratic Review* 17 (September 1845): 205; Samuel Colton Journal, 4, 7 (Manuscripts Department, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, MA).

20. Rufus Woodward to Stanley Woodward, May 21, 1849, box 4, folder 4, Woodward Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society); Charles Loring Brace, *Hungary in 1851; with An Experience of the Austrian Police* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1852), vii, 101.

21. C. Edwards Lester, *My Consulship*, 2 vols. (New York: Cornish, Lamport, 1853), 2:249, 245; William Elliott to Ann Elliot, September 20, 1855, Elliott and Gonzales Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection); Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*, 2:501.

22. Orville Vernon Burton, *The Age of Lincoln* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008), foregrounds millennialism's place in antebellum culture.

23. As in Michael A. Morrison, "American Reaction to European Revolutions, 1848–1852: Sectionalism, Memory, and the Revolutionary Heritage," *Civil War History* 49 (June 2003): 111–32; and Gemme, *Domesticating Foreign Struggles*.

24. Pennell, *Charles Godfrey Leland*, 2:202; *The Life and Letters of Stephen Olin, Late President of the Wesleyan University*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1854), 1:248; Brace, *Hungary in 1851*, 267.

25. On the development of racial science, see William R. Stanton, *The Leopard's Spots: Scientific Attitudes toward Race in America, 1815–1859* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), 35–37; Bruce Dain, *A Hideous Monster of the Mind: American Race Theory in the Early Republic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 43–115; Alexander O. Boulton, "The American Paradox: Jeffersonian Equality and Racial Science," *American Quarterly* 47 (September 1995): 467–92; Charles Colbert, *A Measure of Perfection: Phrenology and the Fine Arts in America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

26. As described by Howe, *Political Culture of the American Whigs*, 39, but not Horsman's *Race and Manifest Destiny*.

27. On the development of an ideology of Anglo-Saxonism and racial science applied to Europeans, see Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny*; Peter D'Agostino, "Craniums, Criminals, and the 'Cursed Race': Italian Anthropology in American Racial Thought, 1861–1924," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44 (April 2002): 319–43. James Brewer Stewart, "The Emergence of Racial Modernity and the Rise of the White North, 1790–1840," *Journal of the Early Republic* 18 (Summer 1998): 181–217, makes a strong ar-

gument for the emergence of a racially bifurcated society, based on innate differences between those of European and African descent, by the 1830s. Arguments that make the more difficult case for concepts of whiteness resting on distinctions between European peoples include Linda Frost, *Never One Nation: Freaks, Savages, and Whiteness in U.S. Popular Culture, 1850–1877* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005); David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991); Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Noel Ignatiev, *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995).

28. A sentiment that British travelers at midcentury reciprocated, according to Martin Crawford, "British Travellers and the Anglo-American Relationship in the 1850s," *American Studies* 12 (August 1978): 203–19.

29. "The Anglo-Saxon Race: An Inquiry into the Causes of its Unrivalled Progress, with some Considerations Indicative of its Future Destiny," *American Whig Review* 7 (January 1848): 29; "The Anglo-Saxon in America," *Littell's Living Age* 9 (April 1846): 52 (reprinted from *Congregational Journal*); J. B., "Reply to E.D. and Mr. Simms," *Southern Literary Messenger* 10 (May 1844): 296.

30. [Samuel Young], *A Wall Street Bear in Europe, with His Familiar Foreign Journal of a Tour through Portions of England, Scotland, France and Italy* (New York: Samuel Young Jr., 1855), 129.

31. J. C. Nott and Geo. R. Gliddon, *Types of Mankind: or, Ethnological Researches . . .* (Philadelphia: Lippincott and Grambo, 1854), 404–5; J. T. Headley, *Letters from Italy* (New York: Wiley and Putnam, 1845), 222–23.

32. "Mutilation" in Sickles to George Peabody, October 4, 1854, printed in *New York Times*, November 6, 1854; "*Americanism*" in "Sickles Abroad," *New York Times*, November 7, 1854. On the affair, see Franklin Parker, *George Peabody: A Biography*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1995), 71–75; Thomas Keneally, *American Scoundrel: The Life of the Notorious Civil War General Dan Sickles* (New York: Nan A. Talese, 2002), 41–43.

33. Robert W. Johannsen, *Stephen A. Douglas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 382–85; [Matthew F. Ward], *Letters from Three Continents, by M., The Arkansas Correspondent of the Louisville Journal* (New York: D. Appleton, 1851), 15, 9.

34. Henry D. Gilpin to mother, June 12, 1853, to George M. Dallas, June 22, 1853 (slavery), "Letters During a Tour in 1853–54," vol. 41, Gilpin Family Papers (Manuscripts Department, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia); George Endicott to William Endicott, August 3, 1847 (Dear England), box 1, folder 20; Sarah Endicott to "folks," August 15, 1847 (home), box 2, folder 2, Endicott Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society).

35. Levin Smith Joynes Diary, June 16, 1840, Joynes Family Papers, section 9 (Virginia Historical Society); *Life and Letters of Stephen Olin*, 1:209; Henry P. Tappan, *A Step from the New World to the Old, and Back Again: with Thoughts on the Good and Evil in Both*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton, 1852), 1:153.

36. Caroline White Diary, July 12, 1855, octavo vol. 1, Caroline Barrett White Papers (American Antiquarian Society); Mary L. McMurran to "my dearest sister," August 26,

1854, John T. McMurran Family Papers (Louisiana and Lower Mississippi Valley Collections, Hill Memorial Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge); Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*, 2:507.

37. Alfred F. Cobden Diary, June 30 (squalor), July 10, 1852 (Manuscripts Department, Special Collections Division, Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, Tulane University). Daniel Walker Howe, "American Victorianism as a Culture," *American Quarterly* 27 (December 1975): 507–32.

38. Eric T. L. Love, *Race over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865–1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).

39. Cornelia Grinnan Diary, n.d. [ca. 1855], 38 (Virginia Historical Society); Benjamin Moran, *The Footpath and Highway: or, Wanderings of an American* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo, 1853), v, 390.

40. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*, 1:296; Grinnan Diary, 126.

41. Dorothy Ross, "'Are We a Nation?': The Conjuncture of Nationhood and Race in the United States, 1850–1876," *Modern Intellectual History* 2 (2005): 327–60; Eric Kaufmann, "American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Anglo-Saxon Ethnogenesis in the 'Universal' Nation, 1776–1850," *Journal of American Studies* 33 (December 1999): 437–57. Melinda Lawson, *Patriot Fires: Forging a New American Nationalism in the Civil War North* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002), argues that northern nationalism remained weak and localized until during the Civil War.

42. "The Anglo-Saxons and the Americans: European Races in the United States," *American Whig Review* 15 (September 1851): 188.

43. Gary W. Gallagher, *The Union War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 47.

44. George Bancroft, "The Necessity, the Reality, and the Promise of the Progress of the Human Race," quoted in Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), 446–47. My understanding of American nationalism owes much to Greenfeld's discussion on pp. 438–51.

45. Ambrose Carlton to James H. Gardner, June 28, 1854, section 2, Ambrose Carlton Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Caroline White Diary, May 15, 1855; Margaret Nimmo Tucker Diary, ca. September 31, 1857, vol. 1, Margaret Nimmo Tucker Papers (Virginia Historical Society).

46. Stephen Salisbury III to Channing Clapp, December 28, 1856, Letterbook of Stephen Salisbury III, vol. 3, box 67, Salisbury Family Papers (American Antiquarian Society); James Johnston Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, April [?], 1850, Pettigrew Family Papers (Southern Historical Collection); Ambrose Carlton to Mary Ann Dow Carlton, May 22, 1854, Ambrose Carlton Papers.

47. Peter C. Baker, *European Recollections. An Address Delivered before the New York Typographical Society, on Franklin's Birthday, January 17, 1861* (New York: Baker and Godwin, 1861), 36; Caroline White Diary, June 14, 1855.

48. "An Abolition Delegate on His Travels," *Sunday Times, and Noah's Weekly Messenger*, February 16, 1851, p. 2, col. 5. Works that argue that proslavery thought was deeply embedded in southern culture include Drew Gilpin Faust, "The Proslavery Argument in History," in *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South,*

1830–1860, ed. Drew Gilpin Faust (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 1–19; Manisha Sinha, *The Counterrevolution of Slavery: Politics and Ideology in Antebellum South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

49. On this point, see Seth Rockman, *Scraping By: Wage Labor, Slavery, and Survival in Early Baltimore* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); and Michael Zakim, *Ready-Made Democracy: A History of Men's Dress in the American Republic, 1760–1860* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

50. Manigault, "Autobiography," 104; Levin Smith Joynes to Anne Ball Joynes, October 5, 1842, Joynes Family Papers, section 6. On Americans' fascination with the lives of the rich, see, e.g., A Member of the Philadelphia Bar, *Wealth and Biography of the Wealthy Citizens of Philadelphia . . .* (Philadelphia: G. B. Zieber, 1845).

51. Augustin L. Taveau to Catherine Waring, March 1853, Augustin Louis Taveau Papers (David M. Rubinstein Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Duke University, Durham, NC); [Aaron Smith Willington], *A Summer's Tour in Europe, in 1851: in a Series of Letters Addressed to the Editors of the Charleston Courier by "A Traveller"* (Charleston: Walker and James, 1852), 43; James H. Gardner to Phebe P. Gardner, November 12, 1853, folder 3, section 8, Gardner Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society). On southern resistance to the demands of sectional ideologues, see William W. Freehling, *The Road to Disunion*, vol. 1, *Secessionists at Bay, 1776–1854* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). On intellectuals and southern nationalism, see John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830–1860* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979); Robert E. Bonner, *Mastering America: Southern Slaveholders and the Crisis of American Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Paul D. H. Quigley, "'That History Is Truly the Life of Nations': History and Southern Nationalism in Antebellum South Carolina," *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 106 (January 2005): 7–33.

52. For a game, albeit unconvincing, restatement of the view that slaveholders were antagonistic to modernity, see Marc Engal, "Counterpoint: What If Genovese Is Right? The Premodern Outlook of Southern Planters," in *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress*, ed. L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 269–87. The more convincing argument for southern modernity may be found in Brian Schoen, *The Fragile Fabric of Union: Cotton, Federal Politics, and the Global Origins of the Civil War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009); see also James L. Huston, "Property Rights in Slavery and the Coming of the Civil War," *Journal of Southern History* 65 (May 1999): 249–86.

53. James Johnston Pettigrew to James C. Johnston, April [?], 1850, Pettigrew Family Papers; George Henry Calvert, *Scenes and Thoughts in Europe* (New York: George P. Putnam, 1855), 145.

54. Robert Ralph Davis Jr., "Diplomatic Plumage: American Court Dress in the Early National Period," *American Quarterly* 20 (Summer 1968): 164–79 (quote on 173); see also Eyal, *Young America Movement*, 112–13.

55. Charles Godfrey Leland to Charles Leland, July 24, 1846, in Pennell, *Charles Godfrey Leland*, 1:85; Ossoli, *At Home and Abroad*, 250–51.

56. "Diplomatic Dress," *New York Times*, April 19, 1854; Goodrich, *Recollections of a Lifetime*, 2:516–19.

57. Cox, *Buckeye Abroad*, 221. For the concept of the Union discussed in this paragraph, see Kenneth M. Stampp, "The Concept of Perpetual Union," in Stampp, *The Imperiled Union: Essays on the Background of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 3–38; Elizabeth R. Varon, *Disunion! The Coming of the American Civil War, 1789–1859* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2008), 1–6; Nicholas and Peter Onuf, *Nations, Markets, and War: Modern History and the American Civil War* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006); Gallagher, *Union War*, chap. 2.

58. Stephen Salisbury III to Stephen Salisbury II, October 15, 1856; to Georgia Salisbury, November 26, 1857, vols. 2 and 4, Letterbook of Stephen Salisbury III.

59. Levin Smith Joynes Diary, May 31, 1840, section 9, Joynes Family Papers; Mary Anne (Mason) Anderson Diary, July 5, 1857 (cheerful), August 8, 1857 (New Yorkers), section 88, Mason Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society); Stephen Salisbury III to Catharine Flint, February 26, 1857, vol. 3, Letterbook of Stephen Salisbury III.

60. Caroline Barrett White Diary, June 28, 29, 1855; Margaret Nimmo Tucker Diary, n.d. [ca. December 25, 1857]; Manigault, "Autobiography," 145 (Brit), 104 ("unmistakably").

61. Manigault, "Autobiography," 239; Amelia Parker to Ned (?) Parker, February 12, 1858, Parker Family Papers (Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia).

62. James Johnston Pettigrew Diary, February 13, 1850; Manigault, "Autobiography," 108.

63. Tappan, *A Step from the New World to the Old*, 1:123–36; also Stephen Salisbury III to Stephen Salisbury II, February 3, 1857, vol. 3, Letterbook of Stephen Salisbury III.

64. Anne Catherine (Boykin) Jones Diary, May 30, 1851, June 29, 1851; Amelia Parker to Ned Parker, August 30, 1857, Parker Family Papers.

65. Peter Onuf observes, "Until the final crisis of the union, few Southerners believed that the national identity they shared with Americans everywhere was incompatible with slavery and its 'natural' expansion." "Antebellum Southerners and the National Idea," in *Old South's Modern Worlds*, ed. Barnes, Schoen, and Towers, 40.

66. William Ware, *Sketches of European Capitals* (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, 1851), 204–5.

67. [Willington], *Summer's Tour*, 47–48; [Ward], *Letters from Three Continents*, 17; Conway Robinson to James Alfred Jones, September 11, 1853, Conway Robinson Letterbook, Robinson Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society). Examples of this sentiment could be multiplied. Randal MacGavock, a young Tennessean, visited Europe in 1851. He concluded, "Let those who speak of disunion, who have sectional prejudices, or who are blindly led by party rule, make the tour of the Old World, and if I am not greatly mistaken they will return home with national ideas, national love, and national fidelity." Randal W. MacGavock, *A Tennessean Abroad: Letters from Europe, Africa, and Asia* (New York: Redfield, 1854), 398.

68. "The Twenty-Seventh National Anti-Slavery Anniversary," *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, November 1, 1860; *North Star*, April 10, 1851.

69. Frederick Douglass to William Lloyd Garrison, January 1, 1846, in Philip S. Foner, ed., *Life and Writings of Frederick Douglass*, vol. 1, *Early Years, 1817–1849* (New York: International, 1950), 129; Joseph Sturge, *A Visit to the United States in 1841* (London:

Hamilton, Adams, 1842), 176; William J. Grayson, "MacKay's *Travels in America*—the Dual Form of Labor," *DeBow's Review* 28 (July 1860): 60. On the "mudsill" theory, see Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 346–47.

70. *The American Prejudice Against Color. An Authentic Narrative, Showing how Easily the Nation got into an Uproar, By William G. Allen, A Refugee From American Despotism* (London: W. and F. G. Cash, 1853), 8; W. C. Bennett, "Give Back his Slave? An English Answer to the American Slave-Owner who Demands John Anderson, from Canada," in Harper Twelvetrees, *The Story of the Life of John Anderson, the Fugitive Slave* (London: William Tweedie, 1863), 181; "Great Anti-Slavery Meeting in Wakefield," *Frederick Douglass's Paper,* February 17, 1860.

71. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, *Eighty Years and More (1815–1897): Reminiscences of Elizabeth Cady Stanton* (New York: European, 1898), 87; Allen to William Lloyd Garrison, June 20, 1853, in *Liberator,* July 22, 1853; Thompson quoted in *Tenth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society* (Boston: Dow and Jackson's, 1842), 69; *Anti-Slavery Almanac* reprinted in *Colored American,* September 5, 1840.

72. On this long-standing debate in the antislavery movement, see Matthew Mason, *Slavery and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), chap. 4; see also Mason, "The Battle of the Slaveholding Liberators: Great Britain, the United States, and Slavery in the Early Nineteenth Century," *William and Mary Quarterly,* 3rd ser., 59 (July 2002): 665–87.

73. Van Gosse, "'As a Nation, the English Are Our Friends': The Emergence of African-American Politics in the British Atlantic World, 1772–1861," *American Historical Review* 113 (October 2008): 1003–28.

74. William Powell to Samuel May Jr., April 5, 1854, Anti-Slavery Collection (Rare Books and Manuscripts, Boston Public Library); Douglass's speech in *National Anti-Slavery Standard,* May 20, 1847; Douglass to Garrison, May 23, 1846, in Foner, *Life and Writings of Douglass,* 1:172; Asenath Nicholson, *Loose Papers: or Facts Gathered During Eight Years' Residence in Ireland, Scotland, England, France, and Germany* (New York: Anti-Slavery Office, 1853), 311.

75. *Incidents in the Life of Rev. J. Asher, Pastor of Shiloh (Coloured) Baptist Church, Philadelphia, U.S. . . .* (London: Charles Gilpin, 1850), 3–5. Limerick (Ireland) *Reporter* quoted in *Tenth Annual Report,* 65; Longstreet to Howell Cobb, July 21, 1860, in Frank A. Rollin, *Life and Public Services of Martin R. Delany . . .* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1883), 105. Therese A. Donovan, "Difficulties of a Diplomat: George Mifflin Dallas in London," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 92 (October 1968): 421–40.

76. William Powell to Samuel May Jr., April 5, 1854, Anti-Slavery Collection; "Slavery Still at its Dirty Work," letter of Sarah Parker Remond to the *Scottish Press,* December 4, 1859, printed in *British Friend,* January 1860; on Douglass, Richard D. Webb to Maria Weston Chapman, July 16, 1846, in Clare Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists: An Episode in Transatlantic Understanding* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1974), 272–73 (Webb suspected, but could not substantiate, that a visiting southern minister had posted the bills); L. A. Chamerovzow, ed., *Slave Life in Georgia: A Narrative of the Life, Sufferings, and Escape of John Brown, a Fugitive Slave, Now in England* (London: W. M.

Watts, 1855), 170; on Garrison, Samuel May to John B. Estlin, December 1, 1846, in C. Taylor, *British and American Abolitionists*, 302.

77. "Professor Allen on the Slavery of America," *Leeds Mercury*, December 3, 1853 (first Allen quotation); "American Slavery—Lectures at Leeds," *Leeds Times*, December 10, 1853 (second quotation); William Wells Brown, *The American Fugitive in Europe: Sketches of People and Places Abroad* (New York: John P. Jewett, 1855), 184–85; *Proceedings of an Anti-Slavery Meeting, Held at Spafields Chapel, on Friday Evening, 14th October, 1859*, London Emancipation Committee's *Tracts*, no. 2 (1859), 12. See also R. J. M. Blackett, "Fugitive Slaves in Britain: The Odyssey of William and Ellen Craft," *Journal of American Studies* 12 (April 1978): 41–62.

78. On British cooling toward antislavery, see Gosse, "'As a Nation, the English Are Our Friends,'" 1022–23; Nils E. Enkvist, "The *Octoroon* and English Opinions of American Slavery," *American Quarterly* 8 (June 1956): 166–70; and David Brion Davis, *Inhuman Bondage: The Rise and Fall of Slavery in the New World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 76. On minstrelsy in Britain, see J. S. Bratton, "English Ethiopians: British Audiences and Black-Face Acts, 1835–65," *Yearbook of English Studies* 11 (1981): 127–42; Michael Pickering, "White Skin, Black Masks: 'Nigger' Minstrelsy in Victorian England," in *Music Hall: Performance and Style*, ed. J. S. Bratton (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986), 70–91; George F. Rehin, "Blackface Street Minstrels in Victorian London and Its Resorts: Popular Culture and Its Racial Connotations as Revealed in Polite Opinion," *Journal of Popular Culture* 15 (Summer 1981): 19–38; Rehin, "Harlequin Jim Crow: Continuity and Convergence in Blackface Clowning," *Journal of Popular Culture* 9 (Winter 1975): 682–701; Douglas C. Riach, "Blacks and Blackfaces on the Irish Stage, 1830–1860," *Journal of American Studies* 7 (December 1973): 231–41; Sarah Meer, "Competing Representations: Douglass, the Ethiopian Serenaders, and Ethnic Exhibition in London," in *Liberating Sojourn: Frederick Douglass & Transatlantic Reform*, ed. Alan J. Rice and Martin Crawford (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999), 141–68; Douglas Lorimer, "Bibles, Banjoes, and Bones: Images of the Negro in the Popular Culture of Victorian England," in *In Search of the Visible Past: History Lectures at Wilfred Laurier University, 1973–4*, ed. Barry M. Gough (Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 1975), 31–50.

79. H. B. Bascom, *Methodism and Slavery: With Other Matters in Controversy between the North and the South . . .* (Frankfort, KY: Hodge, Todd, and Pruett, 1845), 53; Tyler quoted in Evelyn L. Pugh, "Women and Slavery: Julia Gardiner Tyler and the Duchess of Sutherland," *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 88 (April 1980): 194. See also Elizabeth Kelly Gray, "Whisper to Him the Word 'India': Trans-Atlantic Critics and American Slavery, 1830–1860," *Journal of the Early Republic* 28 (Fall 2008): 379–406.

80. John B. Estlin, *A Brief Notice of American Slavery, and the Abolition Movement*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: William Tweedie, 1853), 22; Allen's speech in *Story of the Life of John Anderson*, 97, 112.

81. Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010), 190–99. C[harles] J[ared] Ingersoll, *African Slavery in America* (Philadelphia: T. K. and P. G. Collins, 1856), is a typi-

cal example of the genre. Ingersoll accuses British abolitionists and their American allies of attempting to foster disunion.

82. R. J. M. Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall: Black Americans in the Atlantic Abolitionist Movement, 1830–1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983), 20–25.

83. [Josephine Brown], *Biography of an American Bondman, by His Daughter* (Boston: R. F. Wallcutt, 1856), 94; William G. Allen to Charles Sumner, January 24, 1854, Charles Sumner Correspondence (Houghton Library, Harvard University).

84. Richard Hardack, "The Slavery of Romanism: The Casting Out of the Irish in the Work of Frederick Douglass," in *Liberating Sojourn*, ed. Rice and Crawford, 115–41.

85. Douglass to R. D. Webb, November 10, 1845, in Foner, *Life and Writings of Douglass*, 1:122–23; Douglass to Garrison, *Montrose Liberator*, March 27, 1846, in Foner, *Life and Writings of Douglass*, 1:141; "The Right to Criticize American Institutions," in Foner, *Life and Writings of Douglass*, 1:236–37. On the Crafts and poverty, see the remarks of William Craft, *Proceedings of an Anti-Slavery Meeting*, 14.

86. John Stauffer, *The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001).

87. Gosse, "'As a Nation, the English Are Our Friends.'" Parliament passed the act to emancipate West Indian slaves in 1833. Slaves were freed on August 1, 1834, and the apprenticeship system that was supposed to transition from slavery to full freedom was abolished in 1838.

88. W. W. Brown, *American Fugitive in Europe*, 161 (fatherland), 303 (Englishman), 287 (oppression), 168–69 (Scott); Sarah Parker Remond to Wendell Phillips, May 4, 1860, Wendell Phillips Papers (Houghton Library); William and Ellen Craft, *Running a Thousand Miles for Freedom; or, The Escape of William and Ellen Craft from Slavery* (London: William Tweedie, 1860), 94. On black Anglophilia, see, besides Gosse, "'As a Nation, the English Are Our Friends,'" Elisa Tamarkin, *Anglophilia: Deference, Devotion, and Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), chap. 3.

89. Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall*, 21, discusses this perception.

90. Henry B. Stanton, *Random Recollections*, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1887), 103–4, 90 (servility); E. C. Stanton, *Eighty Years and More*, 106, 86–87 (Gurney); Frederick B. Tolles, ed., *Slavery and "The Woman Question": Lucretia Mott's Diary of Her Visit to Great Britain to Attend the World's Anti-Slavery Convention of 1840*, supplement no. 23, *Journal of the Friends' Historical Society* (Haverford, PA: Friends Historical Association, 1952), 50; James Mott, *Three Months in Great Britain* (Philadelphia: J. Miller M'Kim, 1841), 12 (Windsor), 27–28.

91. Mott, *Three Months in Great Britain*, 84; Tolles, *Slavery and "The Woman Question,"* 72–73.

92. Douglass quoted in Rollin, *Life and Public Services of Martin R. Delany*, 126; [J. Brown], *Biography of an American Bondman*, 100–101; Phillips and Douglass in *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, May 20, 1847.

93. For more on this subject, see Patrick Rael, *Black Identity and Black Protest in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), chap. 7; Blackett, *Building an Antislavery Wall*, 12–13.

94. Mott, *Three Months in Great Britain*, 84; Frederick Douglass to Horace Greeley, April 15, 1846, in *Liberator*, June 26, 1846, in Foner, *Life and Letters of Douglass*, 1:148–49. For other examples using the "foul blot" or similar language, see *Colored American*, August 26, 1837, October 2, 1841; the Crafts, *Running a Thousand Miles*, 94; J. D., "The Southern Movement," *North Star*, April 20, 1849. Regarding the "foul blot" language, David Brion Davis argues that in order to "balance the soaring aspirations released by the American Revolution and by evangelical religion," slavery had to be defined as "the great exception to our pretensions of perfection . . . the single manifestation of national sin." The result has been to identify African Americans as a national problem without whose presence the "road would be clear, everything would be perfect." D. B. Davis, *Inhuman Bondage*, 102.

95. David F. Dorr, *A Colored Man Round the World*, ed. Malini Johar Schueller (1858; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 11.

96. As in the subtitle of Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism*; see also Daniel T. Rodgers, "Exceptionalism," in *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*, ed. Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 21–40; Jack P. Greene, *The Intellectual Construction of America: Exceptionalism and Identity from 1492 to 1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993).

97. "A Modell of Christian Charity," in *The American Intellectual Tradition*, vol. 1, *1630–1865*, ed. David A. Hollinger and Charles Capper (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 15. Daniel T. Rodgers, "American Exceptionalism Revisited," *Raritan* 24 (Fall 2004): 21–47.

Conclusion

1. "Miss Remond in Manchester," *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, October 1, 1859; Robert Baird, *Visit to Northern Europe: Or Sketches Descriptive, Historical, Political, and Moral, of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and the Free Cities of Hamburg and Lubeck . . .* , 2 vols. (New York: John S. Taylor, 1841), 2:66.

2. Francis Wayland, *The Duties of an American Citizen: Two Discourses, Delivered in the First Baptist Meeting House of Boston . . .* (Boston: James Loring, 1825), 29, 34.

3. Levin Smith Joynes to William T. Joynes, January 9, 1842, section 7, Joynes Family Papers (Virginia Historical Society, Richmond); Howells, "A Little German Capital," *Nation* 2 (January 4, 1866): 12.

4. John Bigelow, *Retrospections of an Active Life, Part 3: 1865–1866* (New York: Baker and Taylor, 1909), 97–98 (Harvey), 107 (Galignani). The full quote from Webster was "Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

5. *The American Thanksgiving Celebration in Paris, Thursday Evening, December 7, 1865* (Paris: E. Brière, 1865), 1–2, 9–10.

6. Gary W. Gallagher, *The Union War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); by contrast, see Melinda Lawson, *Patriot Fires: Forging a New American Nationalism in the Civil War North* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002).

7. Daniel T. Rogers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

8. Bancroft quoted in Daniel T. Rogers, "Exceptionalism," in *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*, ed. Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), 25. The argument in this paragraph takes issue with Rogers's argument in *Atlantic Crossings* (pp. 3–4) that the transatlantic social politics of the 1890–1942 period represents a cosmopolitan moment sandwiched between two eras of exceptionalist consensus.

This page intentionally left blank

Primary Sources

In this book, I set out to understand what ordinary Americans from the era of the American Revolution through the antebellum period thought about their travels in Europe. To that end I concentrated on manuscript sources—diaries and letters—and now-obscure published accounts. Of course, the women and men whose views this book investigates were anything but "ordinary" by the standards of their day. But they were more ordinary than the subjects of most studies of Americans abroad in this period, which overwhelmingly focus on well-known literary figures.

Most Americans who visited Europe did so only once in their lives. They almost always kept some kind of account of their experiences, both to enshrine their travels in order to revisit them later in life and to share their adventures with friends and family in the States. As a result, historical libraries hold a wealth of diaries, account books, letters, and other ephemera of travel, such as collections of prints, used guidebooks, and the like. The most useful repositories for my research were the Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); the Virginia Historical Society (Richmond); the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; the American Antiquarian Society (Worcester, MA); the Perkins Library at Duke University; the Maryland Historical Society (Baltimore); the Special Collections division of the Howard-Tilton Memorial Library at Tulane University; the Filson Club Historical Library (Louisville, KY); the Massachusetts Historical Society (Boston); the Library Company of Philadelphia; the John Hay Library at Brown University; the South Carolina Historical Society (Charleston); the Albert and Shirley Small Special Collections Library at the University of Virginia; and the Library of Congress.

I also made use of the published letters and diaries of travelers, which are particularly rich, for whatever reason, for the colonial period. Especially worthwhile accounts include Ronald Hoffman, ed., *Dear Papa, Dear Charley: The Peregrinations of a Revolutionary Aristocrat, as told by Charles Carroll of Carrollton and his Father, Charles Carroll of Annapolis, with Sundry Observations on Bastardy, Child-Rearing, Romance, Matrimony, Commerce, Tobacco, Slavery, and the Politics of Revolutionary America*, 3 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and

Culture, 2001); *The Journal of Dr. John Morgan of Philadelphia from the City of Rome to the City of London, 1764, with a Fragment of a Journal Written at Rome, 1764, and a Biographical Sketch* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1907); George W. Corner, ed., *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush: His "Travels through Life" Together with his Commonplace Book for 1789–1813*, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 25 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1948); "Journal of Josiah Quincy, Jun., During his Voyage and Residence in England from September 28th, 1774, to March 3rd, 1775," Massachusetts Historical Society *Proceedings* 50 (October 1916–June 1917): 433–71; and H. Trevor Colbourn, ed., "A Pennsylvania Farmer at the Court of King George: John Dickinson's London Letters, 1754–1756," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 86 (July 1962): 241–86, (October 1962): 417–53.

Two sources on South Carolinians are particularly detailed: the accounts of Henry Laurens in Philip M. Hamer et al., eds., *The Papers of Henry Laurens*, vol. 7, *Aug. 1, 1769–Oct. 9, 1771*; vol. 8, *Oct. 10, 1771–April 19, 1773*; vol. 9, *April 19, 1773–December 12, 1774* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Historical Society, 1980–81); and Mabel L. Webber, ed., "Peter Manigault's Letters," *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* 31 (July 1930): 171–183, (October 1930): 261–82; 32 (January 1931): 46–60, (April 1931): 115–30, (July 1931): 175–92; 33 (January 1932): 55–62, (April 1932): 148–53, (July 1932): 247–50.

Worthwhile accounts from the postrevolutionary era include Vernon Snow, ed., "The Grand Tour Diary of Robert C. Johnson, 1792–1793," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 102 (February 1959): 60–105; and Minnie Claire Yarborough, ed., *The Reminiscences of William C. Preston* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1933). For the reflections of two articulate, self-confident people, see Thomas Adam and Gisela Mettele, eds., *Two Boston Brahmins in Goethe's Germany: The Travel Journals of Anna and George Ticknor* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2009). Two diaries of privileged young men provide extraordinary detail on European travel in the early antebellum era: Donald G. Rohr, ed., *The Young John Carter Brown in Europe: Travel Diaries, 1823–1824* (Providence: John Carter Brown Library, 2005); and Garner Ranney, ed., *A Man of Pleasure—and a Man of Business: The European Travel Diaries of Duncan Farrar Kenner, 1833–1834* (New Orleans: Center for Louisiana Studies and the Hermitage Foundation, 1991). Betty Wood, ed., *Mary Telfair to Mary Few: Selected Letters, 1802–1844* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007), features the correspondence of a cultured, well-traveled, independent, and opinionated southern woman in the early republic. Mary Mayo Crenshaw, ed., *An American Lady in Paris, 1828–1829: The Diary of Mrs. John Mayo [Abigail de Hart Mayo]* (Boston and New York: Hougton Mifflin, 1927), is also worth a look.

For contemporary published accounts, the go-to source is Harold Frederick Smith, ed., *American Travellers Abroad: A Bibliography of Accounts Published before 1900*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1990). Also useful is James Schramer and Donald Ross, eds., *American Travel Writers, 1776–1864* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1997).

Secondary Sources

Travel as a cultural practice in its own right is a surprisingly rare subject in American historical literature. Travel accounts are almost always used as evidence but very rarely feature as a subject. Foster Rhea Dulles, *Americans Abroad: Two Centuries of European Travel* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1964), is still useful, though indifferently sourced. Maurie McInnis, ed., in collaboration with Angela D. Mack, *In Pursuit of Refinement: Charlestonians Abroad, 1740–1860* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), contains outstanding essays on a variety of subjects pertaining to South Carolinians in Europe. Mark Rennella and Whitney Walton, "Planned Serendipity: American Travelers and the Transatlantic Voyage in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Journal of Social History* 38 (Winter 2004): 365–83, challenges conventional wisdom about travelers' subjectivity. Essential statistical evidence on Americans abroad is presented with exemplary clarity and brevity in Brandon Dupont, Alka Gandhi, and Thomas J. Weiss, "The American Invasion of Europe: The Long Term Rise in Overseas Travel, 1820–2000," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13977 (May 2008). Although it does not study travel as such, Philipp Ziesche's *Cosmopolitan Patriots: Americans in France in the Age of Revolution* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010) foregrounds the observations of travelers.

Historians have done better with domestic than transatlantic travel. John F. Sears, *Sacred Places: American Tourist Attractions in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), is an important pioneering work. Richard H. Gassan's *The Birth of American Tourism: New York: The Hudson Valley, and American Culture, 1790–1830* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008) builds on Sears's insights. Charlene M. Boyer-Lewis, *Ladies and Gentlemen on Display: Planter Society at the Virginia Springs, 1790–1860* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2002), and Thomas A. Chambers, *Drinking the Waters: Creating an American Leisure Class at Nineteenth-Century Mineral Springs* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002), creatively use travel to analyze the intersection of sectionalism and nationalism in the antebellum United States. Cindy S. Aron, *Working at Play: A History of Vacations in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), situates travel in the long history of American recreation.

Literary critics have been quicker than historians to grasp the significance of overseas travel by Americans. Important works with a historical bent include Philip Rahv, *Discovery of Europe: The Story of the American Experience in the Old World* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1960); William W. Stowe, *Going Abroad: European Travel in Nineteenth-Century American Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); Larzer Ziff, *Return Passages: Great American Travel Writing* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Mary Suzanne Schriber, *Writing Home: American Women Abroad, 1830–1920* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1997); and Christopher Mulvey, *Transatlantic Manners: Social Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Anglo-American Travel Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). Many of these works were influenced by Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992), which focused on the ways travelers employed their writings to objectify

and control foreign peoples. Despite its occasional use of the writings of ordinary and/or unknown travelers, this scholarship relies mainly on the writings of famous figures such as Emerson, Margaret Fuller, and Henry James.

Many works address travel by Americans to specific countries. Britain as a destination takes the palm, not surprisingly, but much of it has an Anglophilic bent. Among many works, see R. B. Mowat, *Americans in England* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1935); Walter Allen, ed., *Transatlantic Crossing: American Visitors to Britain and British Visitors to America in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: William Morrow, 1971); Allison Lockwood, *Passionate Pilgrims: The American Traveler in Great Britain, 1800–1914* (New York: Cornwall Books, 1981); Robert E. Spiller, *The American in England during the First Half Century of Independence* (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1976); and William L. Sachse, *The Colonial American in Britain* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956). More focused works include John Harley Warner, "American Doctors in London during the Age of Paris Medicine," in *The History of Medical Education in Britain*, ed. Vivian Nutton and Ray Porter (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1995), 341–65; and Willard Connely, "Colonial Americans in Oxford and Cambridge," *American Oxonian* 29 (1942): 6–17, 75–77. Particularly useful to this study were Julie Flavell, *When London Was Capital of America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010); and the tragically unpublished dissertation by Susan L. Lively, "Going Home: Americans in Britain, 1740–1776" (Harvard University, 1997).

The literature on Americans in France is less rich than that on Britain but is at least not marred by extremes of love or hatred. Especially notable is Harvey Levenstein, *Seductive Journey: American Tourists in France from Jefferson to the Jazz Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), which is both readable and extremely well researched. William Lloyd Chew III, "Life in France between 1780 and 1815 as Viewed by American Travelers" (PhD dissertation, Eberhard-Karls University [West Germany], 1986), and Chew's "Life before Fodor and Frommer: Americans in Paris from Thomas Jefferson to John Quincy Adams," *French History* 18 (2004): 25–49, argue that Americans encountered France through a haze of prejudices and preconceptions that fatally limited their ability to see it on anything approximating its own terms. The aforementioned *Cosmopolitan Patriots: Americans in France in the Age of Revolution* by Philipp Ziesche takes a more sophisticated tack on Americans' subjectivity. Useful but more specialized works include John Harley Warner, *Against the Spirit of the System: The French Impulse in Nineteenth-Century American Medicine* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); and Guillaume de Bertier de Sauvigny, "American Travelers in France, 1814–1848," in *Diplomacy in an Age of Nationalism: Essays in Honor of Lynn Marshall Case*, ed. Nancy M. Barker and Marvin L Brown Jr. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971), 11–24. Older and not specifically focused on travelers, but still very useful, is Henry Blumenthal, *American and French Culture, 1800–1900: Interchanges in Art, Science, Literature and Society* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana University Press, 1975).

Works on travel outside France and Britain are predictably sparse, although Italy has received some attention—much of it, however, dealing with artists rather than leisure travelers. Erik Amfitheatrof, *The Enchanted Ground: Americans in Italy, 1760–1980* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), is the place to start. Paul R. Baker's *The Fortunate Pilgrims:*

Americans in Italy, 1800–1860 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964) is older but learned. While geographically limited, William R. Vance's sprawling *America's Rome*, vol. 1, *Classical Rome*, and vol. 2, *Catholic and Contemporary Rome* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), is a brilliant work that examines how Americans engaged with the Eternal City. It takes travelers seriously, showing them as open to challenges and new experiences, and portrays Americans as eager participants in an international community. On Germany, see Konrad H. Jarausch, "American Students in Germany, 1815–1914: The Structure of German and U.S. Matriculants at Göttingen University," *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 195–209. On Spain, see Carrie Evangeline Farnham, *American Travellers in Spain: The Spanish Inns, 1776–1867* (1921; New York: AMS Press, 1961). Edward Gray, "The Other Continental Empire: American Perceptions of the Russian Empire, 1776–1789," *Ab Imperio* 2 (2008): 21–46, focuses on the travels of American John Ledyard.

Some of the best, most in-depth, and most accessible works examine individual travelers. Charlene M. Boyer-Lewis, *Elizabeth Patterson Bonaparte: An American Aristocrat in the Early Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), provides a fascinating account of the implications of travel and aristocratic aspiration for one American woman. See also Michael O'Brien, *Mrs. Adams in Winter: A Journey in the Last Days of Napoleon* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010). An outstanding example of travel treated in a biographical framework is Drew Gilpin Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982). Herschel Gower, "Tennessee Writers Abroad, 1851: Henry Maney and Randal W. McGavock," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* 26 (1967): 396–403; Anne Felicity Woodhouse, "Nicholas Biddle in Europe, 1804–1807," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 103 (January 1979): 3–33; and Yonatan Eyal, "A Romantic Realist: George Nicholas Sanders and the Dilemmas of Southern International Engagement," *Journal of Southern History* 78 (February 2012): 107–30, provide short, focused accounts. Two particularly valuable articles shed light on that most inaccessible of subjects, the world of traveling servants: Karen A. Kilcup, "The Domestic Abroad: Cross-class (Re)Visions of Europe and America," *Legacy* 16 (1999): 22–36; and Philip Taylor, "A Beacon Hill Domestic: The Diary of Lorenza Stevens Berbineau," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 98 (1986): 90–115.

For works on transportation and transatlantic travel, see Frank C. Bowen, *A Century of Atlantic Travel: 1830–1930* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1930); and John Malcolm Brinnin, *The Sway of the Grand Saloon: A Social History of the North Atlantic* (New York: Delacorte, 1971). On the very slow transition from sail to steam, the unmatched source is Stephen Fox, *Transatlantic: Samuel Cunard, Isambard Brunel, and the Great Atlantic Steamships* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003). On the unprecedentedly fast improvements in travel during the early nineteenth century, the classic source still holds up: George Rogers Taylor, *The Transportation Revolution, 1815–1860* (New York: Rinehart, 1951). Taylor's account has received an appreciative update in Daniel Walker Howe, *What Hath God Wrought: The Transformation of America, 1815–1848* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), chap. 6. The commodification of travel and the growth of mass tourism in the nineteenth

century are elegantly covered by Lynne Withey in *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel, 1750 to 1915* (New York: William Morrow, 1997); and Will B. Mackintosh, "Ticketed Through: The Commodification of Travel in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of the Early Republic* 32 (Spring 2012): 61–89.

Understanding how travelers made sense of their experiences has required immersion in five main streams of scholarship, each very different. The first, and the largest, concerns American national identity. On the colonial period, I was especially influenced by Jack P. Greene, "Search for Identity: An Interpretation of the Meaning of Selected Patterns of Social Response in Eighteenth-Century America," in Greene, *Imperatives, Behaviors, and Identities: Essays in Early American Cultural History* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 143–73; and T. H. Breen, "Ideology and Nationalism on the Eve of the American Revolution: Revisions *Once More* in Need of Revising," *Journal of American History* 84 (June 1997): 13–39. On the postrevolutionary era, see David Waldstreicher, *In the Midst of Perpetual Fetes: The Making of American Nationalism, 1776–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1997), but especially John M. Murrin, "A Roof without Walls: The Dilemma of American National Identity," in *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity*, ed. Richard Beeman, Stephen Botein, and Edward C. Carter (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1987), 333–48.

On the antebellum era, Fred Somkin's *Unquiet Eagle: Memory and Desire in the Idea of American Freedom, 1815–1860* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967) is an older work that captures the boisterous nationalism of the Jacksonian era. Reginald Horsman's deservedly classic work *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), in my view, fails to balance its account of race in American culture with an appreciation of antiracist thought. Susan-Mary Grant's quirky *North over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000) makes an intriguing argument about the sectionalization of American nationalism that is, nevertheless, hard to integrate with the literature on this subject. On the South, nationalism, and modernity, see Brian Schoen, *The Fragile Fabric of Union: Cotton, Federal Politics, and the Global Origins of the Civil War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010). A robust (although completely unpersuasive) restatement of the case for southern primitivism is made by Marc Engal, "Counterpoint: What If Genovese Is Right? The Premodern Outlook of Southern Planters," in *The Old South's Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress*, ed. L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Byrne (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 269–87. On the Civil War era, I have found Gary Gallagher's brief for the essential consistency of American nationalism in *The Union War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011) more persuasive than the thesis of Melinda Lawson in *Patriot Fires: Forging a New American Nationalism in the Civil War North* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002). The theoretical literature on nationalism is very large, but most authors struggle to integrate the United States into a general scheme of nationalism's development. A striking exception is Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992). On

American engagement with the outside world, a pioneering work is Lawrence A. Peskin and Edmund F. Wehrle, *America and the World: Culture, Commerce, Conflict* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012).

Britain was the indispensable country in early American history. Whether loathing it or loving it, few travelers could escape grappling with the complex meanings of England in the American imagination. Most work focuses, understandably, on Anglophobia. The most recent work is also the most subtle and sophisticated: Sam W. Haynes, *Unfinished Revolution: The Early American Republic in a British World* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2010). See also Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984); and Paul A. Gilje, *The Road to Mobocracy: Popular Disorder in New York City, 1763–1834* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987). Popular Anglophobia is captured nicely in Paul Johnson, *Sam Patch, the Famous Jumper* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2003). The opposing sentiment is a relatively neglected subject. Elisa Tamarkin, *Anglophilia: Deference and Devotion in Antebellum America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), is a frustrating but occasionally insightful study.

On American engagement with transatlantic reform and revolutionary movements, see in particular Leslie Butler, *Critical Americans: Victorian Americans and Transatlantic Liberal Reform* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Margaret H. McFadden, *Golden Cables of Sympathy: The Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-Century Feminism* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1999); and the classic work by Frank Thistlethwaite, *The Anglo-American Connection in the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959). Much of the literature on transatlantic reform has focused on antislavery. In this large literature, see especially Van Gosse, "'As a Nation, the English Are Our Friends': The Emergence of African-American Politics in the British Atlantic World, 1772–1861," *American Historical Review* 113 (October 2008): 1003–28; and Alan J. Rice and Martin Crawford, eds., *Liberating Sojourn: Frederick Douglass and Transatlantic Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1999). W. Caleb McDaniel, "Saltwater Anti-Slavery: American Abolitionists on the Atlantic Ocean in the Age of Steam," *Atlantic Studies* 8 (June 2011): 141–63, innovatively focuses on the sea voyage itself as a venue for abolitionist agitation and reformist identity formation. On Americans and revolutionary movements—another large and cumbersome body of scholarship—see in general David Brion Davis, *Revolutions: Reflections on American Equality and Foreign Revolutions* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990). Works foregrounding travelers' observations include Larry J. Reynolds, *European Revolutions and the American Literary Renaissance* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988); and the deeply researched book by Timothy Mason Roberts, *Distant Revolutions: 1848 and the Challenge to American Exceptionalism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009).

Like their compatriots at home, travelers struggled to reconcile gentility with their republican identity. The already classic work on this subject—one historians have, nevertheless, struggled to fit into a larger paradigm of American historical development—is Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992). Sometimes obscured by the shadow of Bushman's monumental work but well worth a look is C. Dallett Hemphill, *Bowing to Necessities: A History of*

Manners in America, 1620–1860 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). John F. Kasson's *Rudeness and Civility: Manners in Nineteenth-Century Urban America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1990) and Karen Halttunen's *Confidence Men and Painted Women: A Study of Middle-Class Culture in America, 1830–1870* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982) are also important works. On the colonial period, see Michal Rozbicki, *The Complete Colonial Gentleman: Cultural Legitimacy in Plantation America* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998); and the insightful but frustrating David S. Shields, *Civil Tongues & Polite Letters in British America* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1997).

Catholicism flummoxed travelers at least as much as gentility did. The deep roots of anti-popery in American culture are traced by Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise & Fall of Royal America, 1688–1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2006); and Chris Beneke, *Beyond Toleration: The Religious Origins of American Pluralism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006). On antebellum nativism, Ray Allen Billington's *The Protestant Crusade, 1800–1860* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), always readable, is also still valuable. See also Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know-Nothings and the Politics of the 1850s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); and, for an idiosyncratic take, Jenny Franchot, *Roads to Rome: The Antebellum Protestant Encounter with Catholicism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994). My interpretation of travelers' ambivalent anti-Catholicism was much informed by John Davis, "Catholic Envy: The Visual Culture of Protestant Desire," in *The Visual Culture of American Religions*, ed. David Morgan and Sally M. Promey (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 105–28.

abolitionists, 152–53; African American, 161–63; and American nationalism, 154–55, 163–64; Anglophilia of, 157–58; 160, 162; on "aristocracy of race," 155–56, 164–65; British, 157–61; on European racism, 156–59
Adams, John, 46, 48
Adams, Nabby, 71
Aiken, Daniel, 88, 93, 113
Aiken, Harriet, 129
Albert (prince), 113
Allen, Andrew, 30
Allen, Hugh, 160–61
Allen, John, 13; on extravagance of Americans abroad, 26; on ignorance of Britons toward Americans, 33–34
Allen, William, 13, 30, 34, 41; consumer behavior of, 38–39; criticism of English extravagance by, 27; on Pennsylvanian simplicity, 29
Allen, William G., 156, 159, 161
Ambler, Richard, 13, 14, 23
American Revolution, 63, 128, 130–31
Ames, Nathaniel, 95
Amory, Katherine Greene, 16, 17, 22, 28
Amory, Martha, 82–83, 104, 111–12
Anglophilia, 15–17, 18, 26, 48, 49–50, 134–35, 157–58, 160, 162, 186n14
Anglophobia, 48–49, 50, 136–38; decline of, 53–56, 140–41, 158–59
Anglo-Saxonism, 134–41, 142
anti-Americanism, 51, 161–62; decline of, in Britain, 53–56, 139–40
anti-Catholicism, 16–17, 19, 66–68, 115–22
antiquity, 22–23, 90–93
Apthorp, John, 30, 37, 40
aristocracy, 6, 32–33, 69–76, 85, 90, 109, 111–15, 145–46; allure of, for Americans, 73–76, 99–100, 111–12; inaccessibility of, 36–37
Armistead, Wilson, 157
Atlantic Ocean, 14
Awful Disclosures of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery (Monk), 116

Baillie, Matthew, 33
Baird, Robert, 167
Baker, Peter C., 144
Ballantine, Elisha, 128
Bancroft, George, 63–64, 70, 77, 143, 170–71
Bangs, Mary Grosvenor, 102
Bascom, Henry, 160
Baylor, John, 51
Beecher, Catharine, 101
beggars, 25, 27, 61–62, 88, 90, 146–47
Belcher, Jonathan, 12, 13
Bigelow, Andrew, 52, 53, 56, 66; reassessing *Journal of Travels in England,* 51
Bigelow, John, 169–70
Bingham, Anne Willing, 71
Black Ball Line, 3
Blenheim Palace, 20
Bonaparte, Elizabeth Patterson, 76, 100
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 48, 58, 59–60, 63
Bonaparte, Napoleon, III, 129, 132, 133, 144
Boswell, James, 33
Bowdoin, John Tucker, 60, 67, 69
Brace, Charles Loring, 132–33, 134
Breen, T. H., 37–38

Brewton, Mary, 40
Brewton, Miles, 40
Britain. *See* Great Britain
Bronson, Charlotte Brinckerhoff, 82, 108
Brougham, Henry, 158
Brown, John Carter, 92, 120–21
Brown, Susan, 111
Brown, William Wells, 161, 162–63, 164
Buchanan, James, 137, 148
Buckminster, Joseph Stevens, 49, 65, 67
Bullard, Anne, 89, 102, 120
Bushman, Richard L., 111
Butler, Fanny. *See* Kemble, Fanny
Byrnes, James, 30

Cabot, James E., 105
Cadwalader, John, 39–40
Calhoun, John C., 129
Calvert, George H., 148
Campbell, Thomas, 163
Carlton, Ambrose, 143, 144
Carroll, Charles, II, 24, 36, 40
Carroll, Charles, III (Charley), 12, 13, 24, 36; portrait of, 40; social circle of, 36
Cary, Thomas G., 109
Cass, Lewis, 111
Catholic Church, 6, 16, 66–68; art and architecture of, 17, 66–67, 116–22; and Catholic "envy," 66–67, 116; immorality and, 99–100; poverty and, 19, 63–64, 99, 118; rituals and mass of, 16, 17, 68, 120–21; vitality of, 116–20. *See also* anti-Catholicism
Chastellux, Marquis de, 38, 39
Cheever, George B., 83, 119
Cheever, Henry T., 97, 100, 108, 110, 118–19
Chew, Benjamin, 27–28
Child, Lydia Maria, 84
Civil War, U.S., 168–71
Clark, John A., 88, 92, 99, 117
Clarke, James Freeman, 109, 110
Classical Tour through Italy (Eustace), 54
Cobden, Alfred B., 140
Colles, Augusta, 111
Colles, Harriet, 110
Colles, James, 88, 100
Colman, Henry, 87, 89, 95, 98, 103, 113, 115, 120, 122
consumer revolution, 37–38
consumption, 37–44; éclat of, 38; varieties of, 37–38
Continental Europe: antiquity of, 22; contrasted with Britain, 18–20, 24–25; and ignorance toward Americans / United States, 34. *See also specific countries*
Cook & Son (travel agency), 7
Coombe, Thomas, 27
Cooper, James Fenimore, 127; *Home as Found*, 81
Copley, John Singleton, 2; on France, 25, 28; Grand Tour portraits of, 40–41; *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard*, 40; sociability of, 37
cosmopolitanism, 80, 110, 112–13; consumption and, 39–40; nationalism and, 58–59, 80, 142–54, 167–68, 170–71
Cowper, William, 56
Cox, Samuel, 88, 89, 97, 101, 114, 129, 150
Craft, Ellen, 159, 163
Craft, William, 159, 163
Craig, Jimmy, 76–77
Cresson, Elliott, 97, 117–18, 121, 130
Cricketers, The (Copley), 30
Croghan, George, 14, 19; on France, 25
Cunard Line, 4
Custis, Martha, 120
Cutting, John Brown, 49, 58

Dallam, William S., 78, 79
Dallas, George M., 158
Daniel, John M., 130, 148
Davies, Samuel, 27
Davis, David Brion, 212n94
Davis, John, 66
Delany, Martin, 158
Deserted Village, The (Goldsmith), 100
Dewey, Orville, 82, 92, 108, 117
Dickinson, John, 23–24, 25, 28, 30, 36
domesticity. *See* middle class
Domestic Manners of the Americans (Trollope), 109
Dorr, David F., 165
Douglas, Stephen, 137
Douglass, Frederick, 94, 155, 157, 159, 161–62, 164–65
Doyle, John Edward, 92, 101, 110
Drayton, John, 39

Drayton, William, 43
Drayton family, 31
Drinker, Henry, 18
DuPont, Josephine, 71
Dutens, Louis, 34–35
Dwight, Timothy, 131

Eames, Jane Anthony, 100
Earle, Pliny, 96, 102
Eaton Hall, 146
Edgeworth, Maria, 48, 54–55
Edinburgh, 22, 52–53, 87, 92–93, 99
egalitarianism, 89–90, 145–47
egalitarian myth, 81, 61–62, 87–90, 144–45
Ellett, Charles, 128–29
Elliot, Stephen, 133
Endicott, George, 114, 138
Endicott, Sarah, 138
England. *See* Great Britain
Engleheart, George, 40
Eppes, Josephine, 88, 112
Erskine, David, 53
Estlin, John B., 160
Eustace, John, *Classical Tour through Italy*, 54
Ewing, John, 44
exceptionalism, 68–69, 89–90, 165–66, 167

Faber, Isabella, 117
Fisher, Joshua Francis, 82, 99
Fisher, Sidney George, 82
Fothergill, John, 36
France, 10, 57–61; absolutism in, 24–25; Americans' prejudices toward, 18–19, 57; and British nationalism, 10, 18, 25; Catholic Church and, 16, 100, 117; immorality in, 96–97, 100; national character of, 18–19, 64, 129–30; positive image of, among Americans, 57–58, 60; poverty in, 88; refinement in, 28–29; revolution in, 45, 57–59, 125, 127, 132; women in, 64–65
Franco-Prussian War, 7
Franklin, Benjamin, 9, 11, 23
Franklin, Deborah, 14
Franklin, William Temple, 23
Frere, John, 51
Fry, Elizabeth, 96
Fuller, Margaret, 97, 122, 129, 131, 148–49

Gainesborough, Thomas, 40
Gale, Frederick, 87, 91–92, 94, 103, 104, 118, 121
Galignani's Messenger (newspaper), 169
Gallatin, Albert, 75
Gansevoort, Kate, 94
gardens, 21
Gardner, James H., 147
Garrison, William Lloyd, 157, 159
gentility, 5, 12, 75–76, 107–15, 145, 147–48; ambivalence about, 69, 71–72; colonial Americans' expectations of, 20–21; expenses of, 42–43
George II (king), 24
George III (king), 23, 24, 28
Gienapp, William, 111
Gillespie, William, 91
Gilpin, Henry, 138
Gilpin, Thomas, 13
Glassell, James Minor, 96, 105
Godfrey, John, 59, 65, 67, 68–69, 79
Goldsborough, Robert, 30
Gooch, Philip Claiborne, 128
Goodrich, Samuel, 128, 133, 139, 141, 149
Graeme, Elizabeth, 36, 44; ambivalence of, toward England, 29
Grand Tour, 10–11, 56–57, 81–83, 193n7
Grand Tour, The (Nugent), 38, 54
Grant, Anne, 52
Graves, William, 36
Grayson, Willliam J., 155
Great Britain, 6, 10, 15–29, 97; agriculture in, 18; ambivalence toward, 50; Americans' expectations of, 15, 22, 29, 137–38; antiquity of, 22–23; contrasted with Continent, 18–19, 49–50; corruption of morals in, 28–29, 31–32, 103; corruption of politics in, 28–29, 49; economic development in, 17–19, 21; as "fatherland," 50, 56, 138–39, 162; free government of, 21, 23–26, 143, 157; ignorance toward U.S. in, 33–34, 52; mansions and palaces in, 20; military might of, 23; opulence of, 27, 51; poverty in, 27–28, 87; prosperity of, 17–19; racism in, 157–60; reform culture in, 96; royal family of, 23, 24; as threat to U.S., 45, 48–50; unfamiliarity of Americans with, 14–15
Great Western (ship), 4, 108

Greene, George Washington, 106
Griffitts, Samuel Powel, 42
Grinnan, Cornelia, 140–41
Griscom, John, 54–56, 96; *Letters from Europe*, 48
guidebooks, 4, 5, 54, 83–84; Murray's, 4, 83; Park's, 4; Putnam's, 4

Hamilton, Alexander, 12
Hammond, James Henry, 87, 91
Hand-Book for American Travellers in Europe (Park), 4
Harrison, J. Morrison, 101
Haylander, Julia, 103, 108
Hazard, Ebenezer, on English immorality, 26–27
Headley, Joel, 136
Hill, George Handel, 102
Holyrood Palace, 52
Home as Found (Cooper), 81
Hopkinson, Francis, 10, 15, 17, 36; and George III, 24; on temptations of London, 26
Howe, Daniel Walker, 102
Howells, William Dean, 169
Hungary, revolution in, 132–33

immorality, 71–72, 97–100, 108; in Britain, 26–27, 32–33; in Europe, 46, 98–99; in France, 60, 96–97; in Italy, 65, 104–5; in Russia, 73
improvement, 85, 94. *See also* progress
Ingersoll, Jared, 29
Ireland, 88–89, 92–93
Italy, 65; antiquity of, 91–92; Morgan and Powel in, 34–35; poverty in, 19, 88; prosperity in, 28; revolutions in, 130–31; unification of, 7
Izard, Alice DeLancey, 40, 79; *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard* (Copley), 41
Izard, Ralph, 10; in *The Cricketers*, 30; on degradation of Italy, 22; on French absolutism, 25; *Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard*, 41; portrait of, 40; social circle of, in England, 30
Izard, Ralph, Jr., 58, 79
Izard family, 36

Jacques, George, 89, 122, 132
Jarratt, Deveraux, 14
Jarves, James Jackson, 3, 5
Jay, John, 170
Jefferson, Thomas, 54, 62, 74, 77, 80, 98; discouraging Americans from visiting Europe, 46–47
Jewett, Isaac Appleton, 97, 98, 113, 117, 123
Johnson, Robert C., 50–51, 70, 74, 77
Jones, Kate, 94, 104, 113, 117, 153
Jones, Octavia, 89
Journal of Travels in England, Holland, and Scotland (Silliman), 51
Joynes, Levin Smith, 95, 138, 146, 150, 169
July 4th, celebrations of, 79–80, 150–51

Kaufmann, Angelica, 40–41
Keable, William, 40, 43
Kemble, Fanny, 87, 90, 109
Kendall, George, 130
Kenner, Duncan Farrar, 92, 96
Kimble, Abby, 164
Kinloch, Francis, 18, 49–50, 62, 64, 67, 70, 78
Kirkland, Caroline, 100, 114
Kossuth, Lajos, 126, 137

Lafayette, Marquis de, 57, 75, 105
Laurens, Henry, 16, 19; on beggars, 25; on gardens of Duke de Condé, 21
Legaré, Hugh S., 76
Leland, Charles Godfrey, 128, 133, 148–49
Lesley, J. Peter, 117, 118
Leslie, Andrew, 51, 52
Lester, C. Edwards, 90, 133
Letters from Europe (Griscom), 48
Lincoln, Abraham, 131
Logan, James, 11
London: scale of, 17; squalor of, 27, 51
London, John, 18; on antiquity of England, 22; social isolation of, 33
Louis Napoleon. *See* Bonaparte, Napoleon, III
Louis Philippe (king), 105–6, 111, 113, 128
Lowndes, William, 24, 36–37; consumer behavior of, 42; sociability of, 31
luxury, criticism of, 14
Lyman, Theodore, 65

Macpherson, John, Jr., 22
Manigault, Gabriel, 13, 21; on danger of Atlantic crossing, 14; on France, 19, 20;

social isolation of, 33; tour by, of British manufactories, 17
Manigault, Gabriel Edward, 129, 146, 151, 152
Manigault, Joseph, 73
Manigault, Margaret Izard, 40, 71, 72
Manigault, Peter, 33, 36, 39; consumer behavior of, 42–43; portrait of, 43
Marchant, Henry, 11–12
Marcy, William L., 148
Marryat, Frederick, 122
Martinstein, John H., 93, 114
Mason, John Y., 148, 151
Mason, Mary Anne, 151
Mayo, Abigail de Hart, 115
McCall, Ansel James, 83
McCall, Harry, 1–2, 5, 167
McMurran, Mary, 139
Meyer, Jeremiah, 40
middle class, 81; Anglo-American, 101–2; "comfort" and, 100–101; on Continent, 104–7; culture of, 65–66, 81–82, 84, 98, 107–15; defining, 84–85; women and, 84, 99–100
Middleton, Arthur, 31, 40
Middleton, Henry, 72
Middleton, Henry, Jr., 82, 85, 100, 105, 109
Middleton, Mary, 40
Middleton, Mary Hering, 72–73, 102
Middleton, Thomas, 31, 40
Monroe, James, 79
morality. *See* immorality
Moran, Benjamin, 140–41
Morgan, John, 9, 21, 30, 37, 78; anti-Catholicism of, 16; and challenge to British self-identification, 34–35; consumer behavior of, 38–39; on Florentine prosperity, 28–29; insulted by James Boswell, 33; on Italian poverty, 19; portrait of, 40–41
Morris, Robert Hunter, 27
Mott, James, 163, 164
Mott, Lucretia, 94, 163–64
Mott, Valentine, 94–96, 100
Moultrie, John, 36, 41
Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Izard (Copley), 40
Murray, John, 34

nationalism, 6, 57, 76–80; absence of, in U.S., 6, 45–46, 50; American, 59, 88, 94, 125, 141–54, 163–65, 169–71; British, 9–10, 15–16, 17, 24–25, 26–28; race and, 142–43, 163–64; Union and, 143–44, 147, 149–54
nativism. *See* anti-Catholicism
nature. *See* sublime
Nicholson, Asenath, 157
Niles, Nathaniel, 130
Noah, Mordecai, 50, 54, 78
Nott, Josiah, *Types of Mankind,* 135–36
Nugent, Thomas, *The Grand Tour,* 38, 54

Occom, Samuel, 27
Oldden, James, 49
Olin, Stephen, 134, 138
Onuf, Peter, 80
O'Sullivan, John, 91
Otis, Harrison Gray, 71

Palfrey, William, 20
Palmer, Thomas, 30
Paper War, 54–55, 96
Parke, Thomas, 17; on London prostitutes, 26
Parker, Amelia, 153
Parker family, 152–53
Paul, Rodman, 105
Paulding, James Kirke, *A Sketch of Old England,* 55
Peabody, George, 136–37
Peale, Charles Willson, 39–40
Pemberton, Ebenezer, 13
Pendennis Castle, 22
Penn, Juliana, 36
Penn, Thomas, 23–24
Penn family, 36
Pessen, Edward, 87
Pettigrew, James Johnston, 144, 148, 151
Philadelphia, 10, 34
Pickman, Benjamin, 20, 36
Pillsbury, Parker, 87, 95
Pinckney, Charles, 13, 39
Pinckney, Eliza Lucas, 23, 39; offended by card playing, 31
Pinckney, Mary, 72
Pius IX (pope), 118, 126
Poinsett, Joel Robers, 63, 76, 129–30
police forces, 113–15, 144–45
Pollock, Abram David, 91–92, 96
Portico (periodical), 50

portraits/portraiture, 38, 39–40; Grand Tour, 40–41; South Carolinians and, 39–40
poverty, 26, 61–64, 87–90, 145–47; misgovernment and, 62–64; national character and, 64; race and, 64; in southern Europe, 88–89; in U.S., 89–90, 145–46. *See also* beggars
Powel, Samuel, 10, 16, 20, 21, 30, 37; on audience with George III, 23; and challenge to British self-identification, 34–35, 78; consumer behavior of, 38–39; portrait of, 40, 41
Powell, William, 157, 158
Preston, Johanes, 42
Preston, William C., 52, 76, 78–79; anti-Catholicism of, 67–68; on aristocracy, 75
Prince, Nathan, 17
progress, 86–98; moral reform and, 94–97. *See also* improvement
proslavery argument, 145–47
Protestantism, 9–10; and Anglo-American identity, 9–10, 15–17; and prosperity, 16–17

Quincy, Josiah: on antiquity of England, 22; on English agriculture, 29; on English Great Houses, 20; on English military might, 23; on English poverty, 27
Quitman, Elizabeth, 91

racism, 125, 129–31, 134–36, 142, 163–65; British, 158–60; criticism of, 130–33, 140–41; European, 156–60
reform, 94–97
Remond, Charles L., 156, 157
Remond, Sarah, 156, 158, 162, 167
Revolutions of 1848, 124, 126–34
Reynolds, Joshua, 40
Richardson, Martha, 99
Roberts, George, 39
Robertson, William, 18, 22, 23, 30, 33
Robinson, Conway, 154
Rockwell, Charles, 99, 118, 119, 121
Rome, 91
Romney, George, 40
Roslin Castle, 22
royalty, 69–70, 145–47, 111–15; British, 23–26
Rumsfeld, Donald, 5
Rush, Benjamin, 25, 53, 57; on Anglophilia, 18; anti-Catholicism of, 16; on British Parliament, 24; on French refinement, 28; on Versailles, 25
Rush, James, 53, 71, 73, 76–77
Russell-Greaves, Thomas, 61
Ruston, Thomas, 28
Rutledge, John, Jr., 49, 58, 77, 174n12

Salisbury, Elizabeth, 99
Salisbury, Stephen, II, 95, 110, 113
Salisbury, Stephen, III, 144, 150, 151
Sansom, Joseph, 65, 66–67, 68
Scotland: compared to England, 26–27, 51–52; economic development in, 18; hospitality of, 52–53
Scott, Walter, 152, 162–63
Sedgwick, Catharine, 88, 101, 120
Sentimental Journey through France and Italy (Sterne), 54
Seward, William, 131
Shippen, Edward, 12
Shippen, Joseph, 13, 19; anti-Catholicism of, 16, 17; consumer behavior of, 38, 42; on Florentine prosperity, 28–29; on Venetian gentility, 20
Shippen, Thomas Lee, 53–54, 58, 63, 74, 77, 174n12
Shippen, William, 24, 32–33, 34
Short, William, 54, 76, 77
Sickles, Daniel, 136–37
Silliman, Benjamin, 52, 53; *Journal of Travels in England, Holland, and Scotland*, 51
Sketch of Old England, A (Paulding), 55
Smith, Anne Loughton, 40
Smith, Isaac, Jr., 22
Smith, Junius, 4
Smith, Thomas Loughton, 40
Smith, William, 9–10
Smith, William Stephens, 74
sociability: between Americans, 29–37, 76–80, 151–54; barriers to, with Europeans, 31–33, 53, 76; between Britons and Americans, 35–37, 50, 53, 54–55, 101–2; intra-colonial, 31–32

sources, 7–8; published vs. private, 54–55
southerners, 145–48, 151–54
Spain, 88, 97, 100
Spicer, Henry, 40
St. Peter's Basilica, 66, 120–21
Stamp Act, 10
Stanhope, Philip Dormer (Lord Chesterfield), 12, 43
Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, 156, 163
Stanton, Henry, 163
steamships, 4, 7
Sterne, Lawrence, *Sentimental Journey through France and Italy*, 54
Stiles, Ezra, 11
Strahan, George, 14
Strong, George Templeton, 6
Sturge, Joseph, 155
sublime, 93–94; Catholic art and, 121–22

Tappan, Henry, 139
Taveau, Augustin L., 146–47
Taylor, Bayard, 124
Telfair, Mary, 85, 112
Terrell, William, 112
Thompson, George, 156–57
Thoresby, T. E., 159
Thornwell, James Henley, 129
Ticknor, George, 49, 53, 65, 74, 77
Tocqueville, Alexis de, 6–7, 82, 88
tourists, 2–3
travel: business, 13; commodification of, 5, 83–84; convenience of, 4–5, 108–9; expense of, 3–4, 13, 82–83; and letters of credit, 4–5; morality of, 13–14; threat to virtue by, 46
travelers, American, 2, 80; vs. British Grand Tourists, 19; in late nineteenth century, 7–8, 168–69; in mid-nineteenth century, 2–3, 82–86; provincialism of, 15–16, 19; reputation of, 26; women, 2
Trollope, Frances, 122; *Domestic Manners of the Americans*, 109
Tucker, Margaret, 143–44, 151
Tuckerman, Henry T., 89, 122, 132
Turnbull, Robert, 106
Tyler, Julia Gardiner, 160
Types of Mankind (Nott and Gliddon), 135–36

Underwood, Joseph R., 129
union. *See* nationalism
University of Edinburgh, 12
University of Glasgow, 51

Valets de place, 4
Vance, William L. (*America's Rome*), 6
Vaughan, Benjamin, 53
Vaughan, John, 53
Vaughan, William, 53
Versailles, 25, 28, 73–74
Victoria (queen), 103, 112, 137
Victorianism. *See* middle class
virtue. *See* immorality
Voltaire, 21

Walsh, Elizabeth, 109
Walsh, Robert, 112, 148
waltzing, 71
Ward, Matthew, 137, 154
Ware, William, 153
Washington's Birthday, celebrations of, 79–80, 150–51
Watson, Elkanah, 46, 47, 50, 57, 62, 69, 73
Watson, George, 52
Wayland, Francis, 168
Webster, Noah, 6, 73
Weiss, John, 83
West, Benjamin, 13, 34; on British liberties, 24–25; *The Cricketers*, 30; Grand Tour portraits by, 40
West, James, 49, 63; stalking of Napoleon by, 39–40
Westminster Abbey, 22
Wheaton, Catherine, 105
White, Caroline, 139, 143, 144–45, 151
White, James, 38
whiteness, 162–64
Wickham, John, 73–74
Willard, Emma, 94, 102–4, 105–6, 109, 112–13, 114
Williams, William Augustus, 102
Willington, Aaron, 147, 153–54
Wilson, Harriet, 70, 74
Wilton House, 20
Winthrop, John, 165
women, 99–100; British, 102–3; European, agricultural work of, 19–20, 104; European,

women (*cont.*)
contrasted with American, 51, 52, 100, 103–7, 144–45; French, 64–65; travel and, 83–84, 98
Woodward, Rufus, 132
Wormley, Ralph, 30
York Cathedral, 66
Young, Arthur, 19
Young America movement, 131, 138, 148

Zoffnay, Johann, 40